Annamalai University Historical Series No. 21.

THE ROLE OF FEUDATORIES IN PALLAVA HISTORY

BY
M. S. GOVINDASAMY,
LECTURER IN HISTORY,
ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY.

Thesis approved for M. Litt., Degree, 1958.



Published by
THE ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY
ANNAMALAINAGAR
1965

Annamalai University Historical Series No. 21.

THE ROLE OF FEUDATORIES IN PALLAVA HISTORY

BY

M. S. GOVINDASAMY,
LECTURER IN HISTORY,
ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY.

Thesis approved for M. Litt., Degree, 1958.



Published by
THE ANNAMALAI UNIVERSITY
ANNAMALAINAGAR
1965

Foreword

The fruitfulness of the feudatory approach to Pallava History is demonstrated by the author who discusses the problems of origin, identification, achievement and failure with judicial impartiality and succeeds in throwing a good deal of fresh light on the Pallava annals of politics and culture. The historical role of the Banas, Muttaraiyars, Kodumbalur chiefs, Cholas of Uraiyur, Palaiyarai and Renandu, Adigamans and Western Gangas is fully elucidated and a clue is provided for a better understanding of the Pallava decline. The thesis exemplifies the right method of historical investigation and the narrative is readable and free from flaws like padding. The diacritical marks have been placed with great care. In short, Sri Govindasamy's work is a fine piece of historical research, the first step in unfolding the role of feudatories in early South Indian History.

Annamalainagar,
27—2—1965

R. Sathianathaier.

Preface

This thesis is the work done by me as Government of India Research Scholar in Humanities during the period 1954–56, under the supervision of Prof. R. Sathianathaier, Head of the Department of History and Politics, Annamalai University. In his well-known work, Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, Dr. J. F. Fleet rightly remarks that the history of an imperial dynasty will be incomplete without a detailed notice of at least the important feudatory families. That this remark is true also of Pallava history will be evident in the following pages. In the account given below is discussed in detail the history of the Bāṇas, Muttaraiyars, Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs, Chōḷas of Uṟaiyūr, Paḷaiyāṟai and Rēnāṇḍu, Adigamāṉs and Western Gaṅgas with a view to ascertain their role in Pallava history. A separate chapter is devoted to individual feudatories whom one comes across in stray inscriptions. The role of feudatories in war and their exact responsibility for the decline and downfall of the Pallava power are examined as far as available evidences permit. The cultural services rendered by the feudatories particularly in fostering the Bhakti cult, architecture and sculpture are also noted. The original home of the Bāṇas, the origin of

the Muttaraiyars and the chronology of the later Pallava rulers are examined in separate notes appended respectively to Chaps. I, II, and VIII. I am grateful to Prof. R. Sathianathaier for suggesting the subject of research and guiding me throughout. I owe a deep debt of gratitude to the Vice-Chancellor Dr. C. P. Ramaswamy Aiyar for the publication of my thesis under the U. G. C. scheme. I am thankful to the late Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar, the well-known Tamil scholar and historian, Mr. J. M. Somasundaram Pillai, Manager of Publications and Mr. R. Ayyaswamy Aiyar, Assistant Librarian, for their help and interest in the preparation and publication of this thesis. My thanks are also due to the Azhagu Printers Chidambaram for the neat execution of the printing of the work.

Annamalainagar,
27—2—1965

M. S. Govindasamy.

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

A I. - Ancient India

A. S. I. - Archaeological Survey of India

A. S. M. - Archaeological Survey of Mysore

B. S. O. A. S. - Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies

C. L. I. P. S. - Chronological List of Inscriptions of Pudukkottai State

E. C. - Epigraphia Carnatica

E I. - Epigraphia Indica

F. N. S. I. - Foreign Notices of South India

Hist. Inss. S. Ind. - Historical Inscriptions of South India

Hist. Sk. An. Dek. - Historical Sketches of Ancient Dekkan

I. A. - Indian Antiquary

I. P. S. - Inscriptions of Pudukkottai State (Texts)

J. A. - Journal Asiatique

J. A. U. - Journal of the Annamalai University

J. A. H. R. S. - Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society

J. B B. R. A. S. - Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society

J. I. H. - Journal of Indian History

J. M. U. - Journal of the Madras University

J. O. R. - Journal of Oriental Research

J. R. A. S. - Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society

List of Anti. Rem. - List of Antiquarian Remains in the Madras Presidency

Mys. Arch. Rep. – Mysore Archaeological Reports

M. C. C. Mag. – Madras Christian College Magazine

M. E. R. – Madras Epigraphical Reports

Mys. Gaz. – Mysore Gazetteer (Ed. By C. Hayavadana Rao)

M. P. S. – A Manual of Pudukkottai State

N. D. I. – Nellore District Inscriptions

N. I. A. – New Indian Antiquary

P. I. H. C. – Proceedings of the Indian History Congr ess

Q. J. M. S. – Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society

S. I. I. – South Indian Inscriptions

S. I. T. Inss. – South Indian Temple Inscriptions

T. A. S. – Travancore Archaeological Series

THE BĀṆAS: (*c*. A. D. 350 – *c*. 895)

The Bāṇas were a prominent feudatory family figuring in inscriptions of almost all the great powers of Southern India from the fourth century A. D. to the sixteenth century. The history of the Bāṇas is peculiarly interesting in that it illustrates their dynastic drift in all directions in South India. The drift started so early that it is difficult to determine their original habitat. Inscriptions coming from different regions indicate the different territories over which the Bāṇas held sway at different times. Naturally the centre of their power shifted from one place to another.

It is presumed[1] that the Bāṇas were originally feudatories of the Sātavāhanas and after the fall of the Sātavāhana empire became feudatories of the Pallavas of Kāñchi. The earliest epigraphical reference to the Bāṇas is found in the Tāḷaguṇḍa pillar inscription of the Kadamba King Kākusthavarmaṇ. (*c*. A. D. 430–450). The inscription states that, having defeated the frontier-guards of the Pallavas, Mayūraśarmaṇ occupied the forest region upto Śrīparvata i. e., Śrīsailam (Kurnool district) and that he levied tribute from "the circle of kings headed by the Great Bāṇa."[2] It has been rightly inferred by Mr. V. Venkayya that "the Pallava dominions originally extended into the Ceded districts and that the Bāṇas were also ruling some frontier province in that part of

---

1. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX p. 159; 1951.
2. *E. I.* Vol. VIII pp. 34 and 35.

the country during the time of the Kadamba King Mayūraśarmaṉ"[1] There is, therefore, no doubt that in the conflict between the Pallavas and Mayūraśarmaṉ (*c.* A. D. 340–370) the Bāṇas let the former down and became tributary to the latter.[2] It is thus certain that, in addition to the difficulties of continuing the war in a distant, hilly and forest region, the hostile attitude of the Bāṇas forced the Pallavas to make peace with Mayūraśarmaṉ.

Another probable outcome of the submission of the Bāṇas to the Kadambas was the rise of the Western Gaṅgas under Pallava supremacy. The Udayēndiram plates of Pṛithivīpati II state[3] that Koṅgaṇivarmaṉ, the founder of the Western Gaṅga dynasty, was consecrated to conquer the Bāṇa-maṇḍala or country. But this statement has not so far been confirmed by any contemporary W. Gaṅga record, though Pallava paramountcy over the W. Gaṅgas in the fifth century A. D. is borne out by the Penukoṇḍa plates[4] and the Kūḍlūr plates of Mādhavavarma.[5] An Inscription of A. D. 459 from Dod-Ballapur taluk[6] describes Koṅgaṇivarmaṉ as "a wild-fire in consuming the stubble of the forest Bāṇa." But no reference to the consecration by the Pallava King of Koṅgaṇivarmaṉ is found in this record. Thus the consolidation, if not the foundation, of the W. Gaṅga rule and the subsequent subordination of the early Gaṅgas to the Pallavas were the probable results of the acknowledgement by the Bāṇas of Kadamba overlordsip.

---

1. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 231.
2. See Dr. M. Arokiaswami - *The Kongu country*. p. 129.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. II, No. 76, v. 13; *I. A.* Vol. XIII. p. 187.
4. *E. I.* Vol. XIV, No. 24.
5. Ins. No. 88 of *A. S. M.* 1930.
6. *E. C.* Vol. IX. D. B. No. 67.

In the middle of the fifth century A. D. the Bāṇas came again under the Pallavas of Kāñchi and held sway over Pāṇarāshṭra which probably comprised a portion of the present South Arcot district. The Lōkavibhāga, a Digambara Jain work in Sanskrit, written by Simhasūri and dealing with Jain cosmography is said to have been copied by Sarvanandi in the village of Pāṭalika in the Pāṇarāshṭra. The Jain manuscript[1] gives us Saka 380 corresponding to the 22nd year of Simhavarmaṇ, king of Kāñchi, as the year in which the copying work was completed. Pāṭalika has been righty identified with Pāṭaliputtiram (Cuddalore N. T.) in the South Arcot district.[2] The term Pāṇarāshṭra indicates Bāṇa sway over that region, and the mention of the Pallava King's regnal year reinforces the view that by the middle of the fifth century the Pallavas succeeded in bringing the Bānas under their supremacy.

The history of the Bāṇas for the next two centuries is wrapped in obscurity. Their fate during the Kaḷabhra interregnum is not known. The inscriptions of the W. Gaṅga Avanīta and Durvinīta do not make any reference to the Bāṇas though two records of Durvinīta[3] mention his campaigns in the Coimbatore and Salem districts possibly against the Pallavas. Though contemporary Kadamba records make mention[4] of Pallava-Kadamba conflicts, they tell us nothing of the Bāṇas. It is, therefore, clear that the Bānas were not, during this period, subordinate either to the W. Gaṅgas or to the Kadambas. The Kaśākkuḍi plates of Nandivarmaṇ II Pallavamalla[5] while mentioning the success of Simhavishṇu

1. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1910, pp. 45–46.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XIV. p. 334.
3. *E. C.* Vol. IX. D. B. 68; *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1916. p. 45.
4. *I. A.* Vol. VI. pp. 25 & 30; *A. S. M.* 1936 Ins. No. 16.
5. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. II, No. 73, V. 20.

over the Malaya, Kaḷabhra, Mālava, Chōḷa, Kēraḷa, Pāṇḍya and Simhaḷa kings do not allude to the Bāṇas. This leads us to the conclusion that the Bāṇas continued to be feudatories of the Pallavas though their role in the conflicts of the latter with the Kadambas and the W. Gaṅgas remains obscure. Nothing more is known of the Bāna chiefs till they were overcome by the Western Chāḷukyas.

Even at the initial stage of the Pallava- W. Chāḷukya conflict, the Bānas appear to have thrown in their lot with the W. Chāḷukyas. An undated Kannaḍa inscription[1] of a certain W. Chāḷukya Satyāśraya Śrīpṛithvivallabha found at Peddavadugūru records the gift of the village of Nāḍanūru and certain taxes in the country of Bāṇarāja by Eṟeyitiyaḍigaḷ who conquered Raṇavikramaṉ. Since Raṇavikramaṉ is taken to be the other form of Raṇavikrānta,[2] a title of Maṅgalēśa, the paternal uncle and enemy of Pulikeśin II, and Eṟeyitiaḍgaḷ is regarded as identical with Eṟeya[3] a surname of Pulikēśin II, it is highly probable that the Bāṇas became feudatory to Pulikēśin II. This view is further supported by the fact that the successor of Pulikēśin II do not claim in their records the subjugation of the Bāṇas. The absence of any allusion to the Bāṇas in the Aihoḷe inscription perhaps indicates that they came under W. Chāḷukya supremacy after the year A. D. 635 when the record was issued. The change in Bāṇa policy seems to be an outcome of the · Pro–W. Chāḷukya policy of the Chōḷas of Renāṇḍu whose territory was adjacent to that of the Bāṇas.

---

1. 343 of 1920.
2. Paragraphs 1–3 of *M. E. R.* 1921; *çontra* Intro. to No. 46 of *S. I. I.* Vol. IX, pt. I.
3. Paragraphs 1 & 2 of *M. E. R.* 1921; *E. I*, Vol. VII Appe. No. 16.

The vicissitudes of the Bāṇas during the Pallava interregnum in W. Chāḷukya history are not known though a shift in their policy in favour of the victorious Pallavas is not unlikely. An inscription of the Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷa King Puṇyakumāra dated in the first year of W. Chāḷukya Vikramāditya I states that Pōrmukharāma (i. e., Puṇyakumāra) was ruling over Bāṇarāja's territory bounded by the Peṇṇār[1]. The fact that Puṇyakumāra exercised his sway over Bāṇarāja's territory seems to suggest a conflict between the Bāṇas and W. Chāḷukyas and their allies, the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu. But the evidence is not sufficient to come to any definite conclusion. In any case, it is practically certain that Vikramāditya I who revived the W. Chāḷukya power must have received the allegiance of the Bāṇas.

Some of the records of Vijayāditya, the grandson of Vikramāditya I,[2] show that the Bāṇas continued their subordination to the W. Chāḷukyas and were in charge of the Turamara and Vaṅganūr Vishayas. One of the records[3] dated in the 23rd year of Vijayāditya and assignable to A. D. 719–20 refers to a fight in which the rulers of Turamara Vishaya[4] were vanquished by Vikramāditya Bali Indra Bāṇarāja, son of Narasimha Bāṇarāja. The Government Epigraphist thinks[5] that the event referred to here must have been the invasion either of the Pallavas or of their feudatories. But, Dr. T. V. Mahalingam regards it only as a local civil war which was

1. 284 of 1937–38. For a detailed analysis of the record see the chapter on the Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷas,
2. 333 and 359 of 1920; 14 of 1947–48.
3. 359 of 1920.
4. Part or whole of the present Gooty taluk of the Anantapur District – vide paragraph 2 of *M. E. R.* 1921.
5. *Ibid.*

put down by the Bāṇa chief.[1] Little is known of the part played by the Bāṇas in the military expeditions to Kāñchi of W. Chāḷukya Vikramāditya I and his great-grandson, Vikramāditya II.

The history of the Bāṇas for the next two or three decades is not clear. They figure in the inscriptions of W. Gaṅga Śrīpurusha, W. Chāḷukya Kīrtivarmaṉ and Rēnāṇḍu Chōḻa Vijayāditya. It is extremely doubtful if all these Bāṇa chiefs belonged to a single line.[2]

Bāṇa Jayanandivarmaṉ (*c.* A. D. 733–772):

It was during this period that the main line of the Bāṇas again changed their allegiance to the Pallavas. A Tamil inscription found at Guḍimallam[3] and dated in the 23rd year of Nandipōttaraiyar mentions a certain Vikramāditya Māvali Vāṇarāyar who ruled over Vaḍugavaḻi-mēṟku. On palaeographical grounds this inscription is assigned by Mr. V. Venkayya to Nandivarmaṉ II Pallavamalla.[4] The identification of Nandipōttaraiyar of this inscription with Nandivarmaṉ II is strengthened by the fact that the inscription does not mention the conspicuous surname of Nandivarmaṉ III viz., Teḷḷāṟṟeṟinda Nandi i. e., Nandi who was victorious at Teḷḷāṟu, which we find in almost all the records dating from his 10th regnal year.[5] Another inscription[6] dated in the 62nd year of Vijayanandivikramavarmaṉ refers to a certain Māvali Vāṇarāya who ruled over Vaḍugavaḻi Twelve Thousand. On account of the high regnal year, this inscription is assigned

1. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX, p. 163.
2. See the note appended to this chapter.
3. *E I.* Vol. XI. p. 223. Ins. A.
4. *Ibid.* p. 229. f. n. 1.
5. e. g., 52 of 1895 Tillasthanam inscription.
6. *S. I. I.* Vol. III. pt. I, No. 42.

to Nandivarmaṉ II Pallavamalla. Māvali Vāṇarāya of this inscription is very probably identical with Vikramāditya Māvali Vānarāyar.[1] Again this Vikramāditya is probably identical with Nandivarmaṉ or Jayanandivarmaṉ of the Guḍimallam,[2] Udayēndiram[3] and Muḍiyaṉūr[4] plates as the genealogy and chronology of the Bāṇas of this and subsequent period indicate. This conclusion is confirmed by the well-known practice of feudatories assuming the names and titles of their suzerains. It is, therefore, highly probable that Bāṇa Vikramāditya (*c.* A. D. 730) who became feudatory to Nandivarmaṉ II, assumed the name of his overlord manifesting his subordination.[5]

The Bāṇa feudatory of Nandivarmaṉ II Pallavamalla seems to have assisted him in removing the W. Gaṅga menace to the Pallava empire. That the aggression of W.Gaṅga Śrīpurusha in the east included part of the mordern North Arcot district is clear from the existence of a village called Śrīpurushamaṅgalam (Wandiwash taluk, N. Arcot district).[6] In order to recover the lost portions of the Pallava empire, Nandivarmaṉ II undertook a military expedition against Śrīpurusha in his 52nd regnal year (*c.* A. D. 762) as

---

1. *E. I.* Vol. XI. No. 22 Ins. A; *J. I. H.* XXIX p. 168.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XVII. pp. 1–7.
3. *E. I.* Vol. III. p. 74. v. 6.
4. *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 157.
5. He must have felt it necessary to do so as his predecessors were feudatory to W. Chāḷukyas. Moreover Dr. D. C. Sircar thinks (*N. I. A.* Vol. I. p. 245) that he may be identical with Vikramāditya Bali Indra Bāṇarāja of 359 of 1920. This identification, though doubtful, is not unlikely.
6. Vide – Sewell – *List of Anti. Rem.* p. 170.

evidenced by one of his inscriptions.[1] This inscription records the death of Gaṅgadiyaraiyar Kaṉṉāḍu peruṅgaṅgar, the chief of Kaṟkāṭṭur, who, at the instance of māmaḍi, (i.e., uncle) the Bāṇa king, fell on the day when the Pallava army marched against Perumānaḍigaḷ and destroyed the fortress of Peṇkuḷikkōṭṭai. It is clear from this inscription that the Bāṇas supported the Pallava King against Śrīpurusha.[2] Kaṟkāṭṭūr is identified with Kaḷakāttūr in the Chittoor district and Peṇkuḷikkōṭṭai with Kuḷidikki in the Guḍiyattam taluk of the North Arcot district.[3] The Pallava expedition must have been successful as the Taṇḍaṉtōṭṭam plates of Nandivarmaṉ II, dated in his fifty eighth year refers to his triumph over the W. Gaṅga King.[4] We do not know if the Bāṇas occupied the Gaṅga Six-thousand as a result of this war. The reference in the Muḍiyaṉūr plates[5] to the crown and throne of Bāṇa Nandivarmaṉ and the prefix of his name, Jaya, mentioned in the Udayēndiram plates[6] seem to indicate his high political status and his part-of which we know a little, in the martial exploits of Nandivarmaṉ II. Bāṇa Nandivarmaṉ and his successors continued to be feudatory to the Pallavas ruling over the territory known as Perumbāṇappāḍi (also known as Vaḍugavaḷi mēṟku and Vaḍugavaḷi 12000) which comprised the western part of the Chittoor district, the north western part of the North Arcot district, the eastern part of the Kolar district and portions

1. *E. I.* Vol. XXII. pp. 110–113.
2. But Mr. V. Venkatasubba Aiyar gives a very different interpretation. He thinks that the Bāṇa chief supported the Gaṅga cause and his relative fought for it (*E. I.* Vol. XXII. pp. 110–113). Obviously this is erroneous as it implies the unknown and unusual practice of erecting hero-stones for enemies.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. V. p, 529. v. 6.
5. *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 157.
6. *E. I.* Vol. III. p. 78. v. 6.

of the Salem district. Tiruvallam, also known as Vāṇapuram, (N. Arcot district) appears to have then been the seat of their authority.[1]

Vijayāditya I (*c.* A. D. 772–824):

Vijayāditya or Vijayādityadeva was the son and successor of Bāṇa Nandivarmaṇ. An undated Bāṇa inscription, found at Karshnapalle (Punganur taluk, Chittoor district) refers itself to the reign of a certain Bāṇarāsa who was also in charge of the Gaṅga Six–thousand province when Ballaha i. e., the Rāshṭrakūṭa King led a campaign against Kāḍuveṭṭi for not paying tribute. The record states further that, on this occasion a certain servant of Vijayitta, while returning on horse near Kuntiāla, died after slaying Gaṇamūrti.[2] On palaeographical grounds this inscription is assigned to the ninth century.[3] The Rāshṭrakūṭa King, mentioned in the inscription, is Gōvinda III[4] and Kāḍuveṭṭi evidently refers to the Pallava king. It is, therefore, reasonable to identify Vijayitta of this record with Bāṇa Vijayāditya I who was a contemporary of Pallava Dantivarmaṇ[5] and Rāshṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III.[6] We do not know when the Bāṇas occupied the Gaṅga Six–thousand. This territory lay just west of the Bāṇa country and was, for a long time, the bone of contention between the Bāṇas and the W. Gaṅgas. Another inscription found at the same village mentioning a certain Bāṇarāsa, who was the ruler of the Gaṅga Six–thousand may be ascribed to Vijayāditya I.[7] A third inscription, much

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. III pt. I, pp. 88 & 89.
2. 327 of 1912; No. 6 of *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I.
3. Intro. to No. 6 of *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I.
4. Paragraph 15 of *M. E. R.* 1913.
5. *E. I.* Vol. XI. No. 22. p. 225. Ins. B.
6 *Contra.* vide. Intro. to No. 6 of *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I.
7. 323 of 1912.

damaged and dateless, found at Chālamaṅgala (Punganur taluk) refers to a certain Bāṇarāsa and the death of a warrior in battle.[1] This and another damaged record from the same place[2] may be assigned to the same Bāṇa chief. Thus the participation of the Bāṇas in the Pallava–Rāshṭrākūṭa war (*c.* A. D. 804) is clear but not the exact nature of their part in it. It is said that soon after the defeat of Dantivarmaṉ by Gōvinda III, the Bāṇas transferred their allegiance from the Pallavas to the Rāshṭrakūṭas.[3] The Nandi plates of Rāshṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III (A. D. 806)[4] record the grant by Gōvinda III, at the request of Kshatriya Mahābali Bāṇarāja, named Śrīparama, of the village of Kandamaṅgala, to Īśvaradāsa, head of the Sthāna (i. e., maṭha) in the temple on the Nandi hill. The Kannaḍa portion of the plates states that the gift was made for the temple of Māṇikkabbe, daughter of Indapparāsa. The Chik–Ballapur[5] plates of W. Gaṅga Jayatēja state that, in the 17th year of Rāshṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III (A. D. 810), while Īśvaradāsa was the head of the maṭha in the temple on the Nandi hill and while Paḍḍāge was the governor of the Kōyattūr 12000, Ratnāvaḷi, the mother of Bāṇarāsa Daḍḍa-naradhīpa and the beloved queen of Bāṇa Vidyādhararāja, made a grant to the Śiva temple which she had caused to be erected at Nandi. The donee in both the grants is Īśvaradāsa, head of the maṭha or Sthāna on the Nandi hill. Māṇikkabbe is undoubtedly identical with Ratnāvaḷi, the queen of Bāṇa Vidyādhara. Śrīparama Bāṇarāja of the Nandi plates is probably identical with Bāṇa Vidyādhara of the Chik–Ballapur plates. This Bāṇa Vidyādhara is identified

1. 313 of 1912.
2. 335 of 1912.
3. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 205; *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 168.
4. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913–14, paragraphs 68–70.
5. *Ibid.* pp. 35–37.

with Vikramāditya I Bāṇa Vidyādhara, son of Malladēva.[1] No doubt the only Bāṇa chief, so far known to us, bearing this title viz., Vidyādhara, is Vikramāditya I, the father of Vijayāditya II. His earliest known record is dated in the 17th year of Pallava Nandivarman III (*c.* A. D. 843) and he is known to have ruled for about half a century. Apparently he could not be assigned to the early years of the 9th century. Moreover he was the son-in-law of W. Gaṅga Pṛithivīpati I. Inscriptions of the time of Bāṇa Vikramāditya I mention his queens[2] Kundavai and Mahādēvī Aḍigaḷ[3] but not Ratnāvaḷi of the Chik-Ballapur plates. Therefore the identification is highly improbable and Bāṇa Vidyādhara of the Chik-Ballapur plates must be identified with Bāṇa Vijayāditya I.[4]

It is said that Indapparāsa, the father of Māṇikkabbe, mentioned in the Nandi plates, "may perhaps be identical with Govinda III's younger brother, Indra, who founded the Gujarat branch. The supposition derives some support from the respect with which the Bāṇas are spoken of in the records."[5] If that be so, the matrimonial alliance between the Bāṇas and the collateral line of the Rāshṭrakuṭas must have taken place some time before A. D. 806 when the Nandi plates were issued. But it is difficult to say whether the Rāshṭrakūṭa-Bāṇa alliance preceded or followed Dantivarman's conflict with Gōvinda III.

The outbreak of a revolt against Rāshṭrakūṭa Amōghavarsha soon after his accession led to the withdrawal of Rāshṭrakūṭa forces from Gaṅgavāḍi. Taking advantage

---

1. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913–14, p. 37.
2. *S. I. I.* Vol. III Nos. 47 and 48.
3. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 227. Ins. D.
4. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 211.
5. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913–14 paragraph 70.

of this situation, W. Gaṅga Rājamalla I invaded the Pallava empire as evidenced by his Vaḷḷimalai inscription which records his foundation of a Jain shrine at Vaḷḷimalai, and by the mention in some inscriptions[1] of Rājamallachaturvēdimaṅgalam. It may be presumed that in the course of this invasion, Rājamalla I occupied the Gaṅga Six–thousand, vanquishing the Bāṇas.[2] After that, the Bāṇas became again the vassals of the Pallavas. This is confirmed by the Guḍimallam inscription of Dantivarmaṉ which mentions Bāṇa Vijayāditya I.[3]

Before proceeding further, we must pay some attention to the political condition of South India in the 9th century, for it will explain many of the events connected with the history of the Bāṇas in the subsequent period. W. Gaṅga Rājamalla I and his son, Nītimārga I, were engaged in liberating Gaṅgavāḍi from Rāshṭrakūṭa occupation and in checking the growing power of the Bāṇas. Rājamalla II and his brother, Būtuga I, occasionally allied with the Pallavas against the Pāṇḍyas. In the latter half of the 9th century, the W. Gaṅgas waged wars with the E. Chāḷukya king, Vijayāditya III. Rāshṭrakūṭa Amōghavarsha was, for a long time, at war with E. Chāḷukya Vijayāditya II and his illustrious grandson; his protracted war with the W. Gaṅgas came to an end about A.D. 860 and was followed by a matrimonial alliance between the two dynasties. The latter part of his reign was full of rebellions. In brief, Amōghavarsha found it exceedingly difficult to adhere to the forward policy of his distinguished predecessors. The Pallava–Pāṇḍya struggle for supremacy over the Chōḷa country persisted intermittently. Taking advantage of this, the Chōḷas were steadily

---

1. 227 of 1915; 292 and 322 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XIII.
2. *E. C.* Vol. X. Bp. 86.
3. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 225 - Ins. B.

rising to power. This state of affairs afforded opportunities for some of the minor dynasties of Deccan to enlarge their dominions at the cost of their neighbours.

Mallad̄eva (*c.* A. D. 824–843):

Vadhuvallaba Mallad̄eva Nandivarman, also known as Jagad̄ekamalla[1], was the son of Bāṇa Vijayāditya I. He was probably the same person as Daḍḍa-naradhīpa, son of Ratnāvaḷi, mentioned in the Chik-Ballapur plates of Gaṅga Jayat̄eja.[2] He had left a few records of which the Muḍiyaṉūr inscription[3] is notable. An undated inscription of Mallad̄eva is found at Chippili (Madanapalle taluk, Chittoor district). Its provenance is more important than its contents viz., the mention of a gift, for Chippili was at that time the capital of the Chōḷas of R̄enāṇḍu. The record indicates Mallad̄eva's successful invasion of R̄enāṇḍu. The decline of Chōḷas of R̄enāṇḍu coupled with Rāshṭrakūṭa wars with the E.Chāḷukyas and W. Gaṅgas must have facilitated his ambition. As regards his Chōḷa adversary, we know next to nothing; according to Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri's pedigree of R̄enāṇḍu Chōḷas,[4] Divākara Chōḷa was Mallad̄eva's probable contemporary. The course of this invasion is very obscure. We do not know whether on this occasion Mallad̄eva came into contact or conflict with the Vaidumbas, a Telugu feudatory dynasty. But it is clear that before long the Vaidumbas were in possession of R̄enāṇḍu. It is highly probable that the Vaidumbas played a prominent part in compassing the ruin of the R̄enāṇḍu Chōḷas and were later subordinate to the Bāṇas.

---

1. *E. I.* Vol. III. p. 74. v. 9.
2. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913–14, paragraph 59.
3. *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 157.
4. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 248.

The Bāṇa invasion of Rēnāṇḍu involved them in many wars in the subsequent period, and the Pallavas were deprived of Bāṇa assistance in their wars with the Pāṇḍyas. The Muḍiyaṉūr plates of Malladēva describe him as "a sun in awakening the lotus lake of the Bāṇa–vamsa" and as the "ruler of a seven and a half country containing 12000 villages in the Āndhra maṇḍala."[1] In short, Malladēva prepared the ground for the remarkable achievements of his son, Vikramāditya I Vidyādhara.

Vikramāditya (c. A. D. 843–892)

Bāṇa Vikramāditya I succeeded his father and assumed such surnames as Bāṇa Vidyādhara,[2] Jayamēru[3] and Bāṇa-kandarppaṉ.[4] The efforts of Vikramāditya I to reconquer the Gaṅga Six-thousand coupled with his father's invasion of Rēnāṇḍu provoked the hostility of the W. Gaṅgas and the Noḷambas. The Noḷambas were feudatory to the W. Gaṅgas and ruled over the Gaṅga Six-thousand and Noḷambaḷge, the latter comprising the modern districts of Tumkur and Chitaldroog and part of the Anantapur district.[5] They could not ignore the menace of Bāṇa power as their territory was adjacent to that of the Bāṇas. When Nītimārga I Eṟeyagaṅga ascended the Gaṅga throne, he and his Noḷamba feudatory, Poḻal Chōra, waged war with the Bāṇas and in the battle of Murggepāḍi the latter were worsted (c. A. D. 853).[6] The Noḷamba army seems to have raided as far as Kāñchi. The

---

1. *E. C.* Vol. X Mb. 157.
2. *E. I.* Vol. III. p. 78, v. 10.
3. *E. I.* Vol. XVII. p. 6. v. 14.
4. 569 of 1906; *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I. No. 2.
5. *E. I.* Vol. X. p. 57.
6. *E. C.* Vol. X. Kr. 79; 107 of 1899; *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 208; *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 172.

Hindupur record[1] of Nītimārga I dated Saka 775 (A. D. 853) refers to his unnamed Noḷamba feudatory who ruled the country extending upto Kāñchī. But the Bāṇas heroically rolled back the tide of Noḷamba aggression. The capture of Perunagar[2] by Akaḷankattuvaraiyar, a soldier of Vāṇarāyar, mentioned in a 10th year inscription of Vijaya-Kampa-vikramavarmaṉ,[3] is regarded as an indication of the rapid recovery of the Bāṇas.[4] But these events do not find mention in Pallava records. Though hostilities continued between the two parties, some of the inscriptions of Vikramāditya from the Punganur area[5] show his successful efforts to re-establish his authority in the Bāṇa territory. Far from emasculating the Bāṇa power, the battle of Murggepāḍi merely checked their progress for some time. It is evident that the brunt of the battle against the Noḷambas was borne by the Bāṇas.

It appears that sometime after this event, Bāṇa Vikramāditya I reconquered the Gaṅga Six-thousand probably from the Noḷamba feudatory of the W. Gaṅgas as some inscriptions from the Punganur area describe him as the ruler of Vaḍugavaḷi-Twelve-thousand and Gaṅga Six-thousand.[6] This is confirmed by the existence in the Kolar district of some inscriptions which may be ascribed to Vikramāditya I.[7]

---

1. 588 of 1912,
2. Identified with a village about 13 miles from Kāñchīpuram on the road of Wandiwash. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 175.
3. 171 of 1921; *E. I.* Vol. XXIII. p. 143–147.
4. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX pp. 174 & 175.
5. e. g., 569 and 570 of 1906; Nos. 2 and 3 of *S. I. I.* IX. pt. I.
6. 164 of 1933–34; 196 and 197 of 1931–32.
7. *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 230 and 244; *Ibid.* Bp. 48; *Ibid.* Kr. 200 and 235.

This must have further aggravated the hostilities between the Bāṇas and the Noḷambas as is clear from a number of Bāṇa inscriptions mentioning cattle-raids.[1] An undated inscription of Vikramāditya I from Būḍidepaḷḷe (Punganur taluk)[2] refers to the attack on Pulināḍu by the Noḷamba army and the subsequent triumph of the Bāṇa chief over the Noḷambas in the battle of Miniki (or Minuki). The date of this battle is not known.

We shall now devote some attention to the relations between the Bāṇas and the collateral line of the W. Gaṅgas who ruled over Kolar and the north-eastern portions of Gaṅgavāḍi. It seems that in the first half of the 9th century there was no conflict between the main and collateral lines of the W. Gaṅgas. The Udayēndiram plates of Pṛithivīpati II[3] state that Pṛithivīpati I "saved Iriga and Nāgadanta, the sons of King (ko) Diṇḍi, who were afraid, the one from king Amōghavarsha, and the other from the jaws of death." The next verse of the same plates refers to the battle of Vaimbalguṟi, but the enemy of Pṛithivīpati I in that war is not mentioned. Mr. M. V. Krishna Rao[4] and Mr. M. Venkataramayya[5] are of opinon that Pṛithivīpati I fought with Amōghavarsha. At any rate, it is clear that Pṛithivīpati I was not on good terms with Amōghavarsha. In the absence of any indication to the contrary, we may assume that Pṛithivīpati I co-operated with his cousin, Rājamalla I, in driving away the Rāshṭrakūṭas from Gaṅgavāḍi. It appears

---

1. 584 of 1906; 164 of 1933-34; 187, 188, 196, 197, 229 and 230 of 1931-32.
2. 571 of 1906; *S. I. I.* vol. IX. pt. I. No: 4.
3. *S. I. I.* vol. II. No. 76. p. 387.
4. *The Gaṅgas of Talkad.* p. 70.
5. *J. M. U.* XII. p. 209.

that the rise of the Noḷambas under Poḷal Chōra, the son-in-law of Rājamalla I, might have caused the rupture between the main and collateral lines of the W. Gaṅgas. Pṛithivīpati I gave his daughter, Kundavai, in marriage to Bāṇa Vikramāditya I.[1] This matrimonial alliance must have indeed weakened the main dynasty of the W. Gāṅgas for it strengthened their foes, the Bāṇas. The Pallavas gained a good friend in Pṛithivīpati I.

Poḷal Chōra Noḷamba was succeeded by his ambitious son Mahēndra. A hero-stone at Jodi-Dalasigere[2] describes Mahēndra as ruling over the Gaṅga Six-thousand.[3] This record is assigned to A. D. 870. If this date should turn out to be correct, it would be the earliest record of Mahēndra. It is known from this record that when Mahēndra came to power, he wrested the Gaṅga Six-thousand from Bāṇa Vikramāditya I. Another undated inscription[4] from Modugalapalle (Punganur taluk) refers to the raid on Pulināḍu by an unnamed Noḷamba king under the orders of Koṅguṇiaraśar and the capture of Kōyāṟṟūr (i.e., Modern Laddigam, Punganur taluk). It is possible that the Noḷamba king and Koṅguṇiaraśar of this inscription are identical respectively with Mahēndra and Rājamalla II.[5] It is not known if this Noḷamba attack on Pulināḍu was connected with the battle of Minuki, mentioned above.

Two inscriptions of Pallava Nṛipatuṅga[6] dated in his 26th year (*c.* A. D. 875) found at Āmbūr (Vellore taluk,

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. III. pt. I. Nos. 47 and 48.
2. *E. C.* Vol. IX. Hoskote 9, revised edition.
3. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1919 p. 31 paragraph 72.
4. 318 of 1912.
5. *Contra* paragraph 16 of M. E. R. 1913.
6. *E. I.* Vol. IV. No. 23 pp. 180–183.

N. Arcot district) mention a Noḷamba cattle-raid on Āmaiyūr and the death of the son and the servant of Akalaṅkattuvarāyar who was a servant of Piṛudi Gaṅgarāyar. The frequent raids of the Noḷambas on the Pallava empire finally led to a number of wars between the Noḷambas and the Bāṇas.

The Vaidumbas who were in possession of Rēnāṇḍu and hostile to the Noḷambas and the the Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷas cast in their lot with the Bāṇas.[1] They were further supported by a W. Gaṅga king,[2] most probably Pṛithivīpati I.[3] Mayindaḍi or Mahēndravikrama,[4] a Telugu Chōḷa prince of Būdili[5] allied with the Noḷambas. The latter were supported by the W. Gaṅga King, Rājamalla II.[6]

The combatants met on different fronts such as Māndavu,[7] Mudumaḍuvu[8] and Sōremaṭi or Sōramaḍi.[9] Māndāvu may be identified with Mānde in the Penukonda taluk of the Anantapur district.[10] Mudumaḍuvu has been identified with

1. 314 of 1922.
2. 102 of 1899; *E. I.* Vol. VII. pp 22–23.
3. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 212; *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 170.
4. *E. I.* Vol. VII. pp. 22–23.
5. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 197 and *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 170.
6. *E. I.* Vol. XXIV. p. 189. *Contra J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 203 and *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 170.
7. 102 of 1899; *E. I.* Vol. VII. pp. 22–23; *E. C*, Vol. X, Mb. 228. It seems that a Bāna chief who did not belong to the main line of the Bāṇas fought for Rājamalla II. (*E. I.* Vol. VII. pp. 22–4).
8. 314 of 1922.
9. 543 of 1906; *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I, No. 11; 295 of 1905; *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I, No. 14; 296 of 1905; *S. I. I.* IX, pt. I. No. 13; 533 of 1906; *E. I.* Vol. XXIV. p. 192; 308 of 1922; 310 of 1922.
10. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 195 fn.

Mudimaḍugu in the same taluk.[1] Sōremaṭi has been identified with Chōḷemari in the same taluk.[2] The fight at Sōremaṭi appears to have been the final phase of the war which resulted in a great victory for the Bāṇas and the Vaidumbas.

There is a keen controversy among scholars in regard to the date and result of this battle. If we fix at least the approximate date of this war, we can easily solve the problem of identification of the kings and chiefs who took part in it.

Mr. R. S. Panchamukhi is of opinion that the battle of Sōremaṭi was fought in A. D. 885.[3] This is untenable because the Noḷamba–W. Gaṅga alliance did not exist at that time. Noḷamba Mahēndra had turned against Rājamalla II even before A. D. 885.[4]

According to Mr. Venkataramayya,[5] the battle of Sōremaṭi was fought about A. D. 825. This view is based on the following grounds:–

(1) Rāchamalla, mentioned in some inscriptions relating to the battle of Sōremaṭi, must be identified with Rājamalla I because there is no record of Rājamalla II wherein a Noḷamba figures as a subordinate or ally. Noḷamba Mahēndra turned against Rājamalla even before A. D. 878.

(2) The matrimonial alliance between the Bāṇas and the collateral line of the W. Gaṅgas must have taken place in the first half of the 9th century for Pṛithivīpati I belonged to that priod.

---

1. *E. I.* Vol. XXIV. p. 191.
2. *J. M. U.* XII. p. 196.
3. *E. I.* Vol. XXIV. p. 189.
4. See 348 of 1901.
5. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 213.

(3) Kō-Vijaya Narasimhavikramavarmaṉ of the Baṅga-vāḍi inscription (which mentions certain combatants of the battle) must be assigned on palaeographical grounds to the first half of the 9th century.

Let us now examine these grounds in some detail. The earliest known date of the Noḷambas coming into hostile contact with the main line of the W. Gaṅgas, as cited by Mr. M. Venkataramayya himself,[1] is A. D. 892–3.[2] Dr. T. V. Mahalingam says that Mahēndra began his life as a feudatory of the W. Gaṅgas.[3] We have already seen an inscription of Mahēndra[4] describing him as ruler of Gaṅga Six-thousand. The possibility of the inscription being assignable to A. D. 870 strengthens Dr. Mahalingam's view. It is improbable that Rājamalla II (A. D. 870–907) was not from the beginning of his reign on good terms with the Noḷambas. In other words, the possibility of the Noḷamba–W. Gaṅga alliance being in existence in the first decade of the reign of Rājamalla II cannot be denied. We have no evidence for supposing that Rājamalla I fought with Pṛithivīpati I. On the other hand, there is the possibility of the latter co-operating with the former in the wars against the Rāshṭrakūṭas. Thus Rāchamalla of the Sōremaṭi battle is in all probability Rājamalla II and not Rājamalla I (A. D. 817–853).

That Pṛithivīpati I was alive till the famous battle of Śrīpuṟambiyam (*c* A. D. 880) shows that his reign belonged rather to the second half than to the first half of the 9th century A. D. This does not militate against the fact that he was a contemporary of Rāshṭrakūṭa Amōghavarsha

1. *Ibid.* p. 198.
2. *E. C.* Vol. II. Nj. 139.
3. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 176.
4. *E. C.* Vol. IX. Hoskote 9, Revised.

(A. D. 814-878) and is in harmony with the date we have given for Bāṇa Vikramāditya I (c. A. D. 843–892). It is, therefore, very probable that the alliance between Pṛithivīpati I and Bāṇa Vikramaditya I took place in the early years of the second half of the 9th century. As regards the third point viz., the date of Kō-Vijaya-Narasimhavikramavarmaṉ it may be pointed out that the conclusions of Mr. C. R. Krishnamacharlu[1] are solely based on vague scriptal considerations and have not been confirmed by any other evidence.

Thus these grounds are not so solid as Mr. Venkataramayya believes, for supposing that the battle of Sōremaṭi was fought about A. D. 825. Nor do the Maṇṇe plates of Rājamalla I Saka 750) which Mr. Venkataramayya cites in support of his view, throw any light on this battle.[2] The enemies of Rājamalla, referred to in the plates were probably the Rāshṭrakūṭas. The plates do not make any allusion either to the Bāṇas or to the Vaidumbas. The record is silent on the battle of Sōremaṭi. The fact of the matter is that the battle did not take place about A. D. 825. Dr. T. V. Mahalingam accepts this date with reluctance and owns that this conclusion is "based largely on indirect and circumstantial evidence."[3]

Robert Sewell dates this battle at about A. D. 877–78 and states that Noḷamba–W. Gaṅga allies were vanquished by the Bāṇas and the Vaidumbas.[4] This view is supported by Prof. R. Sathianathaier.[5] Sewell based his view mainly on the fact that in A. D. 878–79 Noḷamba Mahēndra occupied the

1. Paragraph 6 of *M. E. R.* 1933–34.
2. Paragraphs 56–61 of *Mys. Arch. Rep*, 1910.
3. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 171.
4. *Hist. Inss. of S. Ind.* pp. 38–39.
5. *The Age of Imperial Kanauj.* p. 162.

Tagaḍūr region which was far away from his own country and subsequently went to war with Rājamalla II. There are some other important facts which point to the same conclusion. The identification of Rāchamalla of the Sōremaṭi battle with Rājamalla II (A. D. 870–907) makes it certain that the battle of Sōremaṭi was fought in the first decade of his reign. This is to some extent corroborated by the date of Mahēndravikrama Chōḷa. According to Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, Mahēndravikrama Chōḷa who took part in the battle of Sōremaṭi must be assigned to a period slightly later than that of Śrīkaṇṭha who appears to have begun his reign in *c*. A. D. 850.[1] This is in consonance with the probable period of Bāṇa–W. Gaṅga alliance (*c*. A. D. 855–880) which synchronized with that of the rise of the Vaidumbas. Therefore the most probable date of the battle of Sōremaṭi is A. D. 877–78. Sewell's view regarding the result of this battle is correct. The silence of the W. Gaṅga and Noḷamba records on the battle of Sōremaṭi points to the triumph of the Bāṇas and the Vaidumbas.[2] One of the Vaidumba inscriptions[3] seems to confirm this conclusion.

The split in the Noḷamba–W. Gaṅga alliance appears to have originated in their defeat at Sōremaṭi and was developed by the aggressiveness of Nolamba Mahēndra. It is not known whether his phenomenal triumph subsequent to that battle synchronized with Eastern Chāḷukya Vijayāditya III's (A. D. 848–92) invasion of Gaṅgavāḍi. Rājamalla II's attempt to check Mahēndra I's military progress in the south is clear

---

1. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. pp. 248 and 250.
2. *Contra J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX p. 171; *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 212; *E. I.* Vol. XXIV. p. 189.
3. *E. C.* Vol. X., Bg. 62.

from the Kaḷakattūr record.[1] While Mahēndra was marching towards Talkad, his generals, Kāḍuveṭṭi and Mṛiḍuva invaded the Bāṇa country and destroyed Permāvi which belonged to the Bāṇas. But before long, Vīrachūḷāmaṇi, the son of Bāṇa Vikramāditya I, triumphed over them.[2] The hostilities between the Bāṇas and the Noḷambas continued for a long time as some inscriptions indicate.[3] Thus the north-western frontier of the Pallava empire was for a long time ably defended by the Bāṇas from powerful enemies and this saved the Pallavas from the trouble of fighting on two fronts.

It appears that some years after the battle of Śrīpuṟambiyam (*c.* A. D. 880), the Bāṇas became independent. A Bāṇa inscription from Tiruvallam (N. Arcot dist.) dated Saka 810 (A. D. 888),[4] mentions no overlord. Some records of Vikramāditya I Vidyādhara, which are dated in his regnal years, probably belong to this period of Bāṇa independence.[5] The records of his son, Vijayāditya II are dated in Saka era,[6] and mention no overlord, thus pointing to the same conclusion. The independence of the Bāṇas about A. D. 888 must have been a serious blow to the declining Pallava power, for the

---

1. 306 of 1912; *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I. No. 20.
   The revised edition of the same record gives a different version of the events. A certain Mahārāja probably a Chōḷa, and not Noḷamba Mahēndra as H. Krishna Sastri said (paragraph 15 of *M. E. R.* 1913) was ordered by the Gaṅga king to attack Pulināḍu.
2. *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I. No. 20; 195 of 1931–32.
3. 99 of 1899; *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 229; *Ibid.* Sp. 5 & 6.
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. III. No. 44.
5. *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 92; *S. I. I.* Vol. VII. No. 2. *Contra*. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. p. 211.
6. (e. g.) *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 227.

Bāṇas were nearer to the seat of Pallava government than any other major feudatory powers. It is not known if the Bāṇas took part in Āditya I's war with Aparājita. The silence of the records of Āditya I on the Bāṇas may be taken to indicate the continuance of their independence.

To sum up, the strategic position of Perumbāṇappāḍi enabled the Bāṇas to play an important part in the foreign affairs of the Pallava empire. The conciliatory policy of the Pallavas towards Mayūraśarmaṇ and the rise of the early W. Gaṅgas under Pallava supremacy were largely influenced by the hostile attitude of the Bāṇas towards the Pallavas. The initial success of the W. Chāḷukya invasions of the Pallava empire and the temporary weakening of the Pallava hold on Chōḷa country in the time of Dantivarmaṇ must be viewed in the light of Bāṇa subordination to the W. Chāḷukyas and the Rāshṭrakūṭas. The independence of the Bāṇas a few years before Aparājita's fall facilitated Āditya I's conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam and thus contributed, though in some measure, to the collapse of the Pallava power.

But the services of the Bāṇas to the Pallava empire cannot be overlooked. They had rendered remarkable assistance to the Pallavas in checking the frequent W. Gaṅga and Noḷamba inroads into the Pallava empire and had borne a conspicuous part in the frontier wars thus relieving the Pallavas of the difficulty of fighting on two distant fronts The Bāṇas were perhaps instrumental in bringing the collateral line of the W. Gaṅgas into intimate contact with the Pallavas. The triumph at Sōremaṭi of the Bāṇas and their ally, Pṛithivīpati I, weakened the main line of the W. Gaṅgas and, to some extent, the Noḷambas and contributed to their mutual hostility. If the Bāṇas and their allies had been defeated in the battle of Sōremaṭi, it would have indeed brought the Pallavas into a serious danger. So far about the political role of the Bāṇas,

We shall now deal with their administrative and cultural services.

Feudatory Status:

The Bāṇas, like other feudatories of their times, dated their inscriptions in the regnal years of their Pallava overlords, and sometimes assumed the names of their sovereigns. They were hereditary rulers having a status higher than that of a governor. They had the right of waging wars with other chiefs and collected certain taxes.[1] In brief, they were quasi-independent and this status had much to do with their role, political and cultural, in Pallava history.

Administration:

The Tamil area of Perumbāṇappāḍi, like other parts of the Pallava empire, was divided into Kōṭṭams, and Kōṭṭams into nāḍus, and each nāḍu contained several villages. It is not definitely known whether Vaḍugavaḷi 12000 refers to 12000 villages or revenue units, though Bāṇa Malladēva's Muḍiyaṉūr grant[2] refers to his country containing 12000 villages in the Āndhra maṇḍala. The Bāṇas maintained harmonious relations with the village assemblies and promoted their growth.[3]

Military Tradition:

Like the ancient Tamils, the Bāṇas also honoured their warriors who died in battles and cattle-raids by erecting Vīrakkal (i.e. hero-stone) and by granting lands. A number of Bāṇa inscriptions from the Chittoor district and Mysore state[4]

1. 188 of 1937–38.
2. *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 157.
3. Nos. 43–48 of *S.I.I.* Vol. III; *E. I.* Vol. XI. pp. 222–240.
4. 188, 196, 197 and 230 of 1931–32; 164 of 1933–34; *S.I.I.* Vol. IX. Nos. 4, 10 and 11; *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 228; *Ibid.* Mb. 92; *Ibid. Sp. 6*; *Ibid.* Bp. 48; *Ibid.* kr. 200; *Ibid.* Bp. 86.

mention kalnāḍu or grant of land to the families of dead heroes, and in one case[1] the whole village of Minuki was gifted away to a hero who distinguished himself in a battle at that place during the rule of Bāṇa Vikramāditya I. In some Bāṇa inscriptions[2] the gift of land is referred to as bāḷgaḷchu which means sword-washing. It seems that lands were gifted away with the washing of the deceased man's sword. It was also known as Raktakoḍagi.[3] The place of the death of a hero was usually marked by a stone which was called Vīrakkal. The name and deeds of dead heroes were engraved on such stones.[4]

It appears that these practices of honouring dead warriors were not widely prevalent in the Pallava empire.[5] "In fact, we have no epigraphical proof of the setting up of a Virakkal before the time of Dantivarman...............These Virakkals are restricted in their provenance, being confined to the North Arcot and Chingleput districts and the disturbance seems to have come from the side of the Noḷambas and the W. Gaṅgas"[6] In this connection, it is worthy of note that the Bāṇas were closely connected with some of the districts mentioned above.

Cattle-raid was another important feature of Bāṇa military tradition. "It is not known if cattle lifting was one of the reasons for the outbreak of hostilities or it was

---

1. 571 of 1906.
2. *E. C.* Vol. X. Sp. 5; 195 of 1931–32.
3. M. V. Krishna Rao — *The Gangas of Talkad. p.* 169,
4. *E. I.* Vol. XXIII. p. 143–147.
5. Dr. C. Minakshi — *Administration and Social life under the Pallavas.* p. 164.
6. *Ibid.* p. 166.

symbolical of the declaration of war by the aggressor and was the first phase of the war."[1]

Constructive Work:

A few inscriptions contain references to the constructive work done by the Bāṇa chiefs and their subordinates. A Bāṇa inscription from Guḍimallam[2] dated in the 49th year of Dantivarmaṉ records a grant of land for making some repairs to a tank called Veḷḷēri. A Grantha-Tamil inscription of Vijayanandivikramavarmaṉ[3] dated in his 21st year and found on a slab in front of the Kapilēśwara temple at Avilāla (Chandragiri taluk, Chittoor district) records a gift of the taxes, Kallāṇakkāṇam and Viḍanāḻi leviable from the village, by Vikramāditya Mahabali Vāṇarāya, for the maintenance of the tank at Avilāli.[4] A third inscription from Maṇampūṇḍi in the Tirukkoyilur taluk records that Aṉikōvaṉ Oṟṟiyūr-piraṭṭi, daughter of Vilāḍarāya and wife of the chief Vairamēga Vāṇakōvaraiyar excavated the irrigation tank at Nichchavinītamaṅgalam and provided a sluice for it.[5] It is not known whether Nichchavinītamaṅgalam is identical with Maṇampūṇḍi or not. It is possible that the tank Bāṇa-śamudram near Vallam (N. Arcot district) was excavated by the Baṇas.[6]

Jainism:

We have already noted the existence of a Digambara Jain monastery at Pāṭaliputtiram (Cuddalore N. T., S. Arcot

---

1. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX. p. 285.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 225. Ins. B; 226 of 1903.
3. 188 of 1937–38.
4. Kallāṇakkāṇam is tax on marriage; Viḍanāḻi also must be a tax.
5. 233 of 1934–35.
6. R. P. Sethu Pillai. *Tamilakam — Ūrum Pērum*, p, 94.

district) which was then situated in the Pāṇarāshṭra. The Lōkavibhāga which deals with Jain cosmography was written in Sanskrit by Simhasūri who was well-versed in Prākṛit as well. The work was copied in A. D 458 by Saravanandi who was proficient in Sanskrit and Prākrit and who was a contemporary of Pallava Simhavarmaṉ I.[1] That the Digambara Jain monastery at Pāṭaliputtiram flourished till at least the reconversion of Appar to Śaivism in the 7th century is clear from the *Periyapurāṇam.*

Vaḷḷimalai, near Tiruvallam (N. Arcot district), appears to have been an important place for the Jains.[2] An inscription from that village[3] refers to a certain Dēvasēna, the pupil of Bhavanandi, who was the spiritual preceptor of a certain Bāṇarāya. The date of this Bāṇarāya is not known. The image of Dēvasēna was perhaps founded by Ajjaṇandi, a well-known Jain preceptor who founded in the same place the images of some other Jain preceptors[4] and who figures in some inscriptions from the Madura district.[5]

Hēlāchārya (or Elāchārya) who lived in the interval between the sixth and ninth centuries A. D. was a native of Poṉṉūr, a Jain village in the North Arcot district.[6] He was a famous Jain preceptor and had many pupils, male and female. He was the inculcator of the Jvālāmāliṉi cult of the Goddess of fire which was later expounded and spread by Indranandi-Yōgindra who flourished in the days of Rāshṭrakūṭa Krishna III (A.D. 939-967).

1. See *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1910 pp. 45 and 46.
2. *E. I.* Vol. IV. pp. 140–2.
3. *Ibid*· Ins. c; No. 6. of 1895.
4. *Ibid.*
5. Paragraph 1 of *M. E. R.* 1910.
6. See paragraphs 73–75 of *M. E. R.* 1929.

Saivism:

The Bāṇas who traced their descent to Mahābali were the ardent votaries of Śaivism, though a few professed Jainism. The Parasurāmēśvara temple at Gudimallam (N. Arcot district) and the Bilvanāthēśvara temple at Tiruvallam (the same district) figure prominently in Bāṇa inscriptions. A Bāṇa inscription from Guḍimallam[1] dated in the 23rd year of Nandivarmaṉ II Pallavamalla records a gift of land for a lamp to burn in the Parasurāmēśvara temple at Tiruvippirambēḍu i.e., Guḍimallam. Another Bāṇa inscription from Tiruvallaṃ[2] dated in the 62nd year of the same king registers a gift of land to the temple at Vāṇapuram i. e., Tiruvallam. The Nandi plates of Gōvinda III[3] record the grant, made at the request of Mahābali Bāṇarāya Śriparama (i. e., Bāṇa Vijayāditya I), of a village to the Śiva temple at Nandi while Īśvaradāsa was the head of the maṭha on the Nandi hill. The Chik-Ballapur plates of Jayatēja[4] dated in the 17th year of the same Rāshṭrakūṭa king state that when Īśvaradāsa, the chief disciple of the Kāḷamukha guru Kālaśakti, was head of the maṭha in the temple on the Nandi hill, Ratnāvaḷi, the beloved queen of Bāṇa Vidyādhara (i. e., Bāṇa Vijayāditya I) made a gift of land to that temple which was constructed by herself. It is thus clear that the Bhōganandīśvara temple was constructed by and named[5] after the Bāṇa queen Ratnāvaḷi, also known as Māṇikkabbe, sometime before A. D. 806. The Kāḷamukhas were held in high esteem by the Bāṇas and the two inscriptions mentioned above refer to a Kāḷamukha maṭha in the Śiva temple on the Nandi hill.

---

1. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 224; 229 of 1903.
2. *S. I. I.* Vol. III. No. 42.
3. *Mys. Arch. Rep. 1913–14*, paragraphs 69–73.
4. *Ibid.* pp. 35–37.
5. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913–14, pp. 35–37.

A copy of an inscription of Nandivarman III dated in his 17th year and found in the Bilvanāthēśvara temple[1] at Tiruvallam states that in accordance with the request of Bāṇa Vikramāditya I, the three villages of Aimbūṇi, Viḷattūr and Amaruṉṟimaṅgalam were granted to the Śiva temple at Tīkkāli-Vallam i. e., Tiruvallam and the villages were clubbed together into one and was named Viḍēlviḍuga-Vikramāditya-Chaturvēdimaṅgalam. The provisions of the grant are interesting and deserve to be quoted *in entenso.* "The members of the assembly of this Viḍēlviḍugu-Vikramāditya-Chaturvēḍimaṅgalam shall have to pay two thousand kāḍi of paddy and twenty kaḷañju of gold which were being paid before by this Amaruṉṟimaṅgalam to this (temple of) Paramēśvara at Tīkkāli-vallam. Of this paddy, six hundred kāḍi of paddy (are allotted) for offerings; five hundred kāḍi of paddy to the Śiva-Brāhmaṇas who desire to be fed, beginning with those in charge of the store-room of the temple; five hundred kāḍi of paddy to those who beat (drums before) oblations; four hundred kāḍi of paddy to those who perform various (other) services, including the singers of the *Tiruppadiyam;* and twenty kaḷañju of gold for the perpetual lamps, bark for anointing the idol and for repairing breaks and cracks, etc.[2] It is very interesting to note the mention made here of persons who had to sing the *Tiruppadiyām* i. e., the *Dēvāram* in the temple. This is the earliest known epigraphical reference to the *Dēvāram* which was considered as a holy book even in the 9th century. Bāṇa Vikramāditya I's queen, Kundavai made many gifts to the Śiva temple at Tiruvallam.[3] An inscription of Vijayāditya II, son of Vikramāditya I,

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. III. No. 43.
2. *Ibid.* LL. 16–23.
3. Nos. 46–48 of *S. I. I.* Vol. III.

dated Saka 820 (A. D. 898) records[1] the gift of his mother to the Śiva temple at Guḍimallam. Besides these, there are a number of other inscriptions mentioning the benefactions to several Śiva temples, of some individuals and subordinates of the Bāṇas[2]. A Bāṇa inscription from Pudupaṭla (Punganur taluk) refers to a certain Jayanāgaṉ who walked into the sacred fire on the day of winter solstice and died[3].

In short, the Bāṇas did much for the growth of Śaivism and in some respects anticipated the religious policy of the Greater Chōḷas. Their enlightened attitude towards other religions is worthy of note. The Bāṇas patronised learning by gifting away lands and villages to learned men[4].

Architecture and Sculpture:

The Chik-Ballapur plates of Jayatēja (A. D. 810) state[5] that the Bhōganandi temple at Nandi (Kolar district) was constructed by Ratnāvaḷi, the beloved queen of Bāṇa Vidyādhara (Bāṇa Vijayāditya I). The same temple is referred to in the Nandi plates (A. D. 806) of Rāshṭrakūta Gōvinda III.[6] Therefore the temple must have been erected sometime before A. D. 806. Additions to the temple were made by the Chōḷas, the Hoysaḷas, the Vijayanagar rulers and the Paḷḷegars. The oldest part of the temple is undoubtedly the

---

1. *E. I.* Vol. XI. pp. 227 & 228 Ins. D.
2. 301 of 1902; 158 and 161 of 1912; 469 of 1937–38; *S. I. T. Inss.* Vol. I; No, 51; *S. I. I.* Vol. III. Nos. 44 & 45.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. IX. pt. I. No. 9.
4. *E. I*, Vol. XVII. pp. 6 & 7; *Ibid.* Vol. V. pp. 49–53; *E. C.* Vol. X. Mb. 157.
5. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913–14, pp. 35–37.
6, *Ibid.* paragraphs 69–73.

Bhōganandīśvara shrine. " It consists of a *garbhagriha, sukhanasi* and a *navaranga* carved with small figures and two pierced windows opposite to each other and a ceiling decorated with *ashtadikpalakas* in their proper directions with Siva and Parvati in the central panel. The outer walls have pilasters and turrets, a frieze of large images representing the marriage of Siva and Parvati, with a smaller frieze of swans above, and conspicuously, two pierced windows which, unlike the perforated windows of other temples, have fine figures of Dakshinamurti, with holes in the interspaces to admit light."[1] In short, the Bhōganandīśvara shrine at Nandi is regarded as "the finest and the most ornate of the Dravidian temples in the province.[2]"

The *navaranga* of this shrine deserves special mention. The four pillars of the *navaranga* are well ornamented in low relief. "The figures on the north-east pillar are particularly interesting, some of the panels illustrating the story of Bali and Vamana. The central ceiling of the *navaranga* .... contains nine panels witn Umāmahēśvara seated in the centre and Dikpālas on their vehicles around. These figures have lithe body, graceful poise and dignified bearing characteristic of Pallava sculptures."[3] The Pallava architectural and sculptural influences that many temples in the Mysore State reveal to us[4], may be accounted for in some measure with reference to the temple at Nandi.

---

1. M. V. Krishna Rao, *Op. cit.* pp. 232–3.
2. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1913–14, p. 12. paragraph 20.
3. *A. S. M.* 1932. p. 69.
4. See *A. S. M.* 1937. p. 7, 28 and 29; *A. S. M.* 1932, p. 70.

A NOTE ON THE HABITAT OF THE BĀṆAS (*c.* A. D. 350 – *c.* 900) :

The most interesting dynastic drift in South Indian History is that of the Bāṇas. In a sense their history from the 4th century onwards till their merger with the Tamil population in the Pāṇḍya country in the 17th century is the history of their drift. So far as our evidence goes, their earliest known home appears to have been somewhere in the forest region of the Kolar district. We have already seen that an inscription of Avanīta,[1] describes Koṅgaṇivarmaṉ as "a wild fire in consuming the stubble of the forest Bāṇa, and that the Udayēndiram plates of Pṛithivīpati II[2] refer to the consecration of Koṅgaṇivarmaṉ by a Pallava king for the purpose of conquering the Bāṇamaṇḍala. Since the testimony of the Udayēndiram plates has not been confirmed by any contemporary W. Gaṅga record, it cannot be utilized for our purpose with any certainty. With regard to the other evidence, it indicates Koṅgaṇivarmaṉ's encounter with the Bāṇās. Seeing that in the middle of the 4th century the W. Gaṅgas could not have been so powerful as to attempt a distant conquest, we may very well conclude that in the time of Koṅgaṇivarmaṉ the Bāṇa territory must have been situated close to that of the W. Gaṅgas. The fact that the Bāṇas called themselves 'Lords of Nandigiri'[3] seems to indicate that their territory in the Kolar district must have comprised the region in and around the Nandi hill. Koṅgaṇivarmaṉ's encounter with the Bāṇas must have resulted in the defeat of the latter. It was probably, on account of their defeat, the Bāṇas moved into the Kurnool district and settled in a region not far away

1. *E. C.* Vol. IX. D. B. No. 67.
2. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. No. 76, V. 13.
3. *E. C.* Vol. X Mb. 157.

from the Śrīparvata hills (Śrīsailam). It must be noted that our view regarding the earliest known habitat of the Bāṇas is based on the probability that Mayūraśarmaṇ's conflict with the Pallavas could not have preceded the foundation of the W. Gaṅga kingdom.

We know from the Tāḷaguṇḍa inscription that Pallava rule was originally extended into the Ceded districts.[1] As Mayūraśarmaṇ is stated in the record to have subjugated the Bāṇas after defeating the frontier guards of the Pallavas,[2] it is certain, as we have stated above, that the Bāṇas were, at that time, ruling over a part of the Kurnool district. If, for argument's sake, it is supposed that the Bāṇas continued to remain in the Kolar district throughout the 4th century A.D., it will be very difficult to explain how Maūraśarmaṇ, however powerful he might be, was able to conquer such a distant territory. Moreover, the Tāḷaguṇḍa inscription does not warrant such a conclusion. Therefore our view that in the second half of the 4th century - before Mayūraśarmaṇ's conflict with the Pallavas, the Bāṇas held sway over part of the Kurnool district cannot be ruled out.

It is very likely that some time after the cessation of hostilities between the Pallavas and Mayūraśarmaṇ, the Bāṇas left the Kurnool district and occupied the Paruvi vishaya which comprised a portion of the present Anantapur district. The exact date of this migration is not known, though there is possibility that it may have happened in the interval between *c.* A. D. 375 and *c.* 425. There is some indication that at the time when the Bāṇas were ruling over the Paruvi vishaya, they were in subordinate alliance with the Kadambas and hostile to the Pallavas. An inscription

---

1. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 239.
2. *E. I.* Vol. VIII. pp. 34 & 35.

of Kākusthavarmaṉ shows that he received the support of the Bāṇas in his war with the Pallavas and Kekayas.[1] It was probably to crush the Bāṇas that the Pallava king Simhavarmaṉ I consecrated Harivarmaṉ, son of Mādhava II[2]. That the Pallava king achieved his purpose is clear from the subsequent history of the Bāṇas. The Penukoṇḍa plates of Mādhava III make it clear that the Bāṇas were not in possession of the Paruvi vishaya and that the W. Gaṅgas held it.[3] The identification of Pāṭalika mentioned in the Lōkavibhāga with Pāṭaliputtiram (Cuddalore N. T.) coupled with the fact that it was situated in the Pāṇarāshṭra[4] enables us to conclude that after their dislodgement from the Paruvi vishaya the Bāṇas must have settled in the South Arcot district. It is extremely doubtful whether Pāṇarāshṭra mentioned in the Lōgavibhāga is identical with Perumbāṇappāḍi of later Bāṇa records.[5] The subsequent history of the Bāṇas till they became subordinate to the W. Chāḷukyas is not clear. Yet it is quite possible that they continued to hold Pāṇarāshṭra in subjection to the Pallavas.

From the middle of the 7th century onwards, we find the Bāṇas paying allegiance to W. Chāḷukya Pulikēśin II and his successors.[6] During this period, the Bāṇas were ruling over portions of the Anantapur and Cuddapah districts.[7] In the second quarter of the 8th century A. D., we find several Bāṇa chiefs figuring in the records not only of the W. Chāḷukya

1. *A. S. M.* 1936. Ins. No. 16.
2. *The classical Age.* p. 269.
3. *E. I.* Vol. XIV. No. 24.
4. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1910 pp. 45–46.
5. *Contra* K. Gopalan. *The Pallavas* p. 66.
6. 343 of 1920; 356, 333 and 359 of 1920; 14 of 1947-48; 339 of 1905; 691 of 1919.
7. *Ibid.*

kings but also of the W. Gaṅga, Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷa and Pallava kings. Two inscriptions from Korrapādu (Jammalamadugu taluk, Cuddapah district) mention a Bāṇa feudatory of W. Chaḷukya Kīrtivarmaṉ II.[1] Another inscription from Chāmalūru[2] (Jammaḷamadugu taluk) refers to a Bāṇa chief who was a feudatory of the Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷa King, Pṛithivī-vallabha Vijayāditya (*c.* 750). An inscription of W. Gaṅga Śrīpurusha[3] from Koṇḍrahaḷḷi (Hoskote taluk, Bangalore district) mentions a Bāṇa chief. Another record of the same king from Huḷḷēnahaḷḷi (Mandya district) mentions Diṇḍigarar who was of Bāṇa decent and who was the ruler of Kaḷbappunāḍu 1700.[4] The Guḍimallam inscription of Nandivarmaṉ II[5] mentions his Bāṇa feudatory. These evidences unmistakably point out that there were several branches of the Bāṇa dynasty. But the main branch must be that which paid allegiance to Nandivarmaṉ II.

We do not know the circumstances under which the main branch of the Bāṇas became subordinate to Nandivarmaṉ II. The Bāṇa chief Jayanandivarmaṉ and his successors are described as ruling over Vaḍugavaḻi mēṟku also called Vaḍugavaḻi Twelve Thousand. Vaḍugavaḻi means in Tamil the northern road and Vaḍugavaḻi mēṟku means the land to the west of the northern road. It is highly probable that there was in ancient times a road known as Vaḍugavaḻi connecting Kāñchīpuram and Nellore; and it was to the west of that road that the Bāṇa country was situated.[6] But, for a clear understanding of the lay of the Bāṇa country in this

1. 418 and 419 of 1940–41.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 242.
3. *A. S. M.* 1941. Ins. No. 1.
4. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1927. p. 109.
5. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 223.
6. For a detailed discussion, see *J. I. H.* Vol. XXIX p. 185.

period, we have to rely on the inscriptions of the Bāṇas. The existence of Bāṇa inscriptions in the western part of the Chittoor district, in the north-western part of the North Arcot district, in the eastern part of the Kolar district and in the north-eastern portion of the Salem district roughly indicates that these areas should have formed what was known as Perumbāṇappāḍi. Doubtless, the frontiers of the Bāṇa country must be at times varying.

II

THE MUTTARAIYARS (*c.* A. D. 650 – *c.* 860) :

The Muttaraiyars were a line of powerful chiefs and were for a long time feudatory to the Pallavas, ruling over portions of the Tanjore and Trichinopoly districts and of the former Pudukkottai State. "The centre of their power was somewhere in the district of Tanjore. Śendalai, at present a small village near Tirukkāttupaḷḷi, appears once to have been a flourishing town with the beautiful name Candralēkha, and either this place or Niyamam in its neighbourhood was most probably the centre of Muttaraiya rule."[1] As their territory lay between the Pāṇḍya and Pallava empires, they were involved in almost all the contests between the two powers. Their subordination was of great assistance to the Pallavas not only in their struggle against the Pāṇḍyas but also in holding the Chōḷas under subjection.

Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ alias Kuvāvaṉ Māṟaṉ.
(c. A. D. 655 – c. 680):

The earliest known member of this feudatory dynasty was Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ alias Kuvāvaṉ Māṟaṉ mentioned in one of the Śendalai pillar inscriptions.[2] He was probably a contemporary of Pallava Paramēśvaravarmaṉ I. It is not unlikely that he established the Muttaraiya power over the Tanjore area. His role in the Pallava–Chāḷukya conflict in the Chōḷa country is not clear.

---

1. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *The Pandyan Kingdom* p. 84. Also see the booklet 'Sendalai' by S. R. Balasubramaniyam.
2. Paragraph 9 of *M. E. R.* 1897; *E. I.* Vol. XIII. p. 139.

Ilangovadiyariyaṉ alias Māṟaṉ Paramēśvaraṉ.
(*c.* A. D. 680– *c.* 705)

Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiyaṉ alias Māṟaṉ Paramēśvaraṉ was the son and successor of Kuvāvaṉ Māṟaṉ.[1] He was a probable contemporary of both Paramēśvaravarmaṉ I and his son, Narasimhavarmaṉ II. Śāttaṉpūdi, a subordinate of Iḷaṅgōvadiyraiyaṉ, constructed the original shrine of the Śiva temple at Nārttāmalai (Kulattur taluk, former Pudokottai State).[2]

Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II alias Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ
(*c.* A. D. 705 – *c.* 745)

Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ alias Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ was the son of Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiyaṉ and a contemporary of Paramēśvaravarmaṉ II and his successor, Nandivarmaṉ II. He is very probably identical with Kāṭaka Muttariyar mentioned in one of the Vaikuntha Perumāḷ temple inscriptions[3] in connection with the accession of Nandivarmaṉ II to the Pallava throne.[4] Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ was thus a faithful subordinate ally of Nandivarmaṉ II from the beginning of his reign.

The Pāṇḍya support to Chitramāya, a rival claimant to the Pallava throne, led them to a war with Nandivarmaṉ II. The date and some other details of the war are not known. But it is clear that the war was a protracted one and in the earlier campaign, the Pallava army was worsted by the Pāṇḍya king Rājasimha I. The Sanskrit portion of the Vēḷvikkuḍi grant[5] states that Pāṇḍya Rājasimha I defeated Pallavamalla who fled from the field of battle. The Tamil

1. *Ibid.*
2. 216 of 1940–41.
3. Paragraph 2 of *M.E.R.* 1906.
4. *The Classical Age* p. 266.
5. *E. I.* Vol. XVII. p. 305, V. 12.

portion of the same grant ascribes to the same Pāṇḍya king a series of victories at Neḍuvayal, Kuṟumaḍai, Maṉṉikuṟichchi, Tirumaṅgai, Pūvalūr, Koḍumbāḷūr, Kuḷumbūr and Periyalūr.[1] "There seems to be little room for doubt that here we get the Pāṇḍyan version of the campaigns which led to the siege of Nandivarman Pallavamalla in Nandigrāma by the Tamil princes."[2] It was probably during this period that W. Chaḷukya Vikramāditya II invaded Kāñchī with success.

While Nandivarmaṉ II was in such a predicament, his great general Udayachandra retrieved the fortunes of the Pallava empire. The siege of Nandigrāma was raised; Pallavamalla was set free; the W. Chāḷukyas were driven away from Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. It was in the southern campaigns of Udayachandra that Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ played a conspicuous part. His Śendalai records[3] describe his triumph over the Pāṇḍyas and the Chēras at Koḍumbāḷūr, Maṇalūr, Tiṅgaḷūr, Kāndaḷūr, Aḻundiyūr, Kārai, Maṟaṅgūr, Aṇṇalvāyil, Śempoṉmāri, Veṇkōḍal (in Tañjai-Sempulanāḍu), Pugaḻi and Kaṉṉaṉūr. But the Pāṇḍya records relating to this period are conspicuously silent on these battles. The Vēḷvikkuḍi grant mentions only the battle of Koḍumbāḷūr in which the Pāṇḍya king is said to have been victorious. The Śendalai records do not mention Udayachandra who had borne the leading part in the southern campaigns of Nandivarmaṉ II. Naturally, a doubt may arise as to the veracity of the claims of the Muttaraya chief. No doubt all the Śendalai records of Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ, except a few, are poems composed by his court poets. Making due allowance for poetic exaggeration, we can state with certainity that the

1. *Ibid.* p. 307, L. 71.
2. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *Op cit.*, p. 57.
3. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. pp. 134–149.

martial exploits of Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ described by his poets are not a figment of their imagination. As Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ was the hero of these records, Udayachandra is not referred to in them. The success of Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ over the Pāṇḍyas is attested by the omission in the Vēḷvikkuḍi grant of the campaigns mentioned in the Śendalai records. The rapid recovery of Nandivarmaṉ II cannot but confirm this conclusion. There can, therefore, be no doubt about Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ's victory in combating the Pāṇḍya aggression which was assisted by the Chēras and the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs.[1]

Not only that. He seems to have recovered his lost territory in the Pudukkottai region as evidenced by his Kiḻḻukōṭṭai inscription (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State) which mentions some of his well-known titles such as Śatrukēsari, Kaḷavarkaḷvaṉ and Abhimāṉadhīraṉ.[2] A Vaṭṭeḻuttu inscription of (Pāṇḍya) Śaḍaiyarmāṟaṉ dated in his 21st (or 29th) year found in the Aḻagar temple at Śevilipēri (Tinnevelly district) records a gift of sheep for a lamp to the temple of Niṉṟaruḷiṉa Karumāṇikkadēvar at Teṉ-Tirumāliruñjolai, a dēvadāṉa Kiḻkaḷa-kūṟṟam by the queen of a certain Śatrubhayaṅkara Muttaraiyaṉ.[3] It is difficult to identify the Pāṇḍya king Śaḍaiyarmāṟaṉ. The Muttaraiya chief of the inscription has been identified with Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II alias

1. S. R. Balasubramanyam – *Op. cit.*, pp. 15–20.
"பல்லவன் வெல்லத் தென்னன் முனையைக் கெடச்
சென்ற மாறன்"
"நின்றடு வில்லவன் வல்லரண் பல்லவன்
செங்தோளெனச் சென்றீடு சீர்த்தி"
"தஞ்சைக்கோன்.........கொடும்பாளூர்
காய்ந்தெறிந்தான்"
2. *C. L. S. P. S.* No. 236.
3. 421 of 1906.

Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ.[1] But the Śendalai records[2] leave no doubt as to the latter's subordination to the Pallavas and hostility to the Pāṇḍyas. Further, there is no evidence that Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II carried his arms as far as Śevilipēri in the Tinnevelly district. Therefore the identification is highly improbable.

As regards the places where Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ gained victories, Koḍumbāḷūr (also called Koḍumbai) Aṇṇalvāyil, Kārai, Kāndaḷūr and Śempoṉmāṟi are situated in the former Pudukkottai state.[3] Tiṅgaḷūr and Maṇaḷūr have been identified with the villages of those names in the Tanjore district.[4] Kaṇṇaṉūr has been identified with Śamayavaram in the Trichinopoly taluk.[5] Pugaḷi may be identified with Pugaḷiyūr in the Karur taluk of the Trichinopoly district. Maṟuṅgūr may be identified with Maruṅgūr in the Nannilam taluk of the Tanjore district. Aḷundiyūr may be identified with Adañjiyūr in the Tanjore taluk. We are unable to identify 'Veṇkōḍal in Tañjai-Sembulanāḍu.'

Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ had several surnames such as Śatrukēsari, Abhimāṉadhiraṉ, Kaḷvarkaḷvaṉ, Atisāhaśaṉ, Śrī Tamarālayaṉ, Neḍumāṟaṉ, Vēḷ-Māṟaṉ, Lord of Tañjai and Lord of Vallam.[6]

---

1. *M. P. S.* Vol. II; pt. II, p. 1254;
2. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. pp. 134–149.
3. *M. P. S.* Vol. II. pt. II. pp. 1254 and *E.I.* Vol.XIII. p.137. According to K. V. Subramanya Aiyar Kāndaḷur is a coastal town and Kāri is identifiable with Kāraiyur in the Tiruppattur taluk of the Ramnad district.
4. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. p. 137.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. pp. 139–149; *C. L. I. P. S.* 236.

In brief Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ had a great share in stabilizing the rule of Nandivarmaṉ II and in safeguarding his empire from powerful enemies such as the Pāṇḍyas and the Chēras.

Viḍēlviḍugu Viḷuppēradi-Araiśaṉ alias Śāttaṉ Māṟaṉ. (c. A. D. 745 – c. 770):

Viḍēlviḍugu Viḷuppēradi - Araiśaṉ alias Śāttaṉ Māṟaṉ[1] may be treated as the immediate successor of Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ[2] His mother Perumbiḍugu Perundēvi has been identified with the queen of Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ.[3] So we may regard him as the probable son of Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ.[4] Moreover, his assumption of the title, Viḍēlviḍugu which was borne by Nandivarmaṉ II[5] makes him a contemporary of the latter, thus strengthening the probability.

During the period of this Muttaraiya chief the Pāṇḍya king Neḍuñjaḍaiyaṉ alias Parāntaka conquered the Chōḷa country, defeating the Pallava army at Peṇṇāgaḍam near Tanjore.[6] The role of the Muttaraiyars in this war is not known. It is, however, clear that their territory was for some time under the Pāṇḍyas. We do not know whether the Tirumayyam inscription[7] of this chief belongs to the earlier or latter part of his reign.

---

1. 402 of 1906; *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 13.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. p. 138; *M. P. S.* Vol. II. pt. I. p. 565.
3. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. p. 138.
4. See *M. P. S.* Vol. II. pt. I. p. 568.
5. *S. I. I.* Vol. IV. No. 135. sect. J,
6. *E. I.* Vol. XVII. p. 308.
7. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 13; 402 of 1906.

Mārppiḍugu alias Pēradiaraiyaṉ (c. A. D. 770 – c. 791):

The successor of Śāttaṉ Māṟaṉ was Māṟppiḍugu Pēradiyaraiyaṉ, a contemporary of Pallava Dantivarmaṉ. Though the two chiefs are mentioned in the Tiruveḷḷaṟai inscription,[1] their relationship is not clear. The rapid but transitory recovery of the Pallavas, perhaps assisted by their Muttaraiya ally, from Pāṇḍya invasion is attested by the existence of an inscription at Kuṉṉāṇḍarkōvil, which is dated in the 5th year of Dantivarmaṉ and which mentions Mārppiḍugu Pēradiyaraiyaṉ. This must have happened either in the beginning of the reign of this chief or towards the close of the regin of his predecessor.

The period of Mārppiḍugu Pēradiyaraiyaṉ witnessed Pāṇḍya Neḍuñjaḍaiyaṉ's second invasion of the Chōḷa country resulting in his triumph at Āyiravēḷi, Ayirūr and Pugaḷiyūr over the Āḍigamāṉ of Koṅgu country who was aided by the Pallava and Kēraḷa rulers.[2] As a result, the Pallavas lost the Kāvērī region. This is clear from the fact that no inscription of Dantivarmaṉ dated after his 16th year is to be found in that region. The part played by the Muttaraiyars in this war is not known. It is certain that the Mārppiḍugu-ēri (ēri = tank) of Ālambākkam and the Mārppiḍugu Peruṅgiṇaṟu[3] of Tiruveḷḷaṟai came into existence during the rule of this Muttaraiya chief.[4] The history of the Muttaraiyars after this period is not sufficiently clear.

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 48.
2. *I. A.* Vol. XXII. p. 73.
3. Peruṅginaṟu = Big well.
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XIII. No. 222; *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 156.

Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ alias Kuvāvaṉ Śāttaṉ (c A. D. 791 – c. 826):

It appears that Mārppidugu Pēradiyaraiyaṉ was succeeded by Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ alias Kuvāvaṉ Śāttaṉ. The Malaiyaḍipaṭṭi inscription of Pallava Dantivarmaṉ[1] dated in his 16th year mentions this chief. He is probably identical with the Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ mentioned in the Śendalai inscription of Māṟañjaḍaiyaṉ dated in his 10th year.[2] If this identification is correct, it will indicate the subordination of this chief to the Pāṇḍya. This change in Muttaraiya policy must have taken place a few years after the 16th regnal year (*c.* 791 A. D.) of Pallava Dantivarmaṉ.

It seems that the Pāṇḍya occupation of the Kāvērī region was of short duration and was followed by Muttaraiya independence. Some inscriptions from the Tanjore district and Kulattur taluk (former Pudukkottai State) are dated in the regnal years of a certain Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar.[3] He seems to have been independent for at least eighteen years.[4] He must be assigned to a period before the beginning of the reign of Śrīmāṟa Śrīvallabha (*c.* A. D. 835 – 862) for the Pallava-Pāṇḍya wars in the Chōḷa country during and after the reign of Śrīmāṟa precludes the possibility of the Muttaraiyars being independent there.

Our next problem is the identification of Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar. It is suggested that Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar is

---

1. *C.L.I.P.S* No. 18.
2. 10 of 1899.
3. 12 of 1899; 61 of 1895; 14 and 39 of 1930–31; *C.L.I.P.S.* No. 237.
4. 12 of 1899.

identical with Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II alias Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ, son of Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiyaṉ alias Māṟaṉ Paramēśvaraṉ. This is mainly based on the view that the name Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar would mean Muttaraiyar who was the son of Iḷaṅgō, and that Iḷaṅgovadiyaraiyan, the first name of his father, might have been abbreviated into Iḷaṅgō when it had to be prefixed to his own name.[1] But the Śendalai records of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II alias Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ do not mention the name Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar. Further, the Pallava-Pāṇḍya wars in the first half of the 8th century, to which we have assigned this Muttaraiya chief, set aside the possibility of any small power like the Muttaraiyars being independent in the Chōḷa country. Moreover, we know that the Piḍāri temple at Niyamam was constructed by Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II alias Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ.[2] An inscription of Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar from Śendalai[3] records a gift to the same temple, but makes no reference to its construction by Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar. If he were its real builder, he would have been certainly so mentioned in the inscription. It is, therefore, clear that this identification suggested by the Government Epigraphist is quite unsatisfactory.

It is not possible to identify Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar with Śāttaṉ Paḷiyili, son of Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ alias Kuvāvaṉ Śāttaṉ, because Śāttaṉ Paḷiyili was a contemporary of Pallava Nandivarmaṉ III and none of the records of Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar mentions the name Śāttaṉ Paḷiyili. Considering all these facts, we may provisionally identify Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyar with Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyan alias Kuvāvaṉ Śāttaṉ.[4]

---

1. Paragraph 20 of *M.E.R.* 1899.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. p. 134.
3. 12 of 1899.
4. *M. P. S.* Vol. II, pt. II, p. 1255.

Śāttaṉ Paḻiyili (*c*. A. D. 826 - *c*. 851).

Śāttaṉ Paḻiyili was the son and successor of Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ alias Kuvāvaṉ Śāttaṉ. We do not have any record of this chief. The Kuṉṉāṇḍārkōvil inscription (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State) which is assigned to Nandivarmaṉ III[1] indicates not only the end of Muttaraiya independence but also the re-establishment of Pallava supremacy in that area in or before the third year of the reign of that king. The Nārttāmalai inscription of Nṛipatuṅga[2] dated in his 7th year (*c*. A. D. 856) refers to a rock-cut temple excavated by Śāttaṉ Paḻiyili, son of Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ. But the inscription does not give any title of Śāttaṉ Paḻiyili. This is significant because almost all his predecessors had borne such titles as Perumbiḍugu, Viḍēlviḍugu and Mārppiḍugu indicating their subordination to the Pallavas. Moreover the conquest of Tanjore by the Chōḷa king Vijayālaya falls, according to our schemes of Muttaraiya genealogy and chronology, within the reign of Śāttaṉ Paḻiyili. It is therefore reasonable to doubt whether Śāttaṉ Paḻiyili was feudatory to the Pallavas. It seems quite probable that Śāttan Paḻiyili began his reign as a feudatory of the Pallavas, and after the battle of Kuḍamūkku (i. e., Kumbakonam), paid his allegiance to the Pāṇḍya king, Śrīmaṟa Śrīvallabha (*c*. A. D. 835–862). The probability is strengthened by the fact that the Pallavas kept quiet when their Chōḷa feudatory, Vijayālaya, took Tanjore from the Muttaraiyars. The role of this Muttaraiya chief in the battles of Teḷḷāṟu and Kuḍamūkku is not clear.

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 46.

2. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 63.

Our knowledge of the immediate successors of Śāttan Paliyili is very limited. An inscription from Nārttāmalai[1] dated in the 7th year of Nṛipatuṅga vikramavarman mentions Śāttan Paliyili's daughter and her husband.[2] The inscription shows that Nṛipatuṅgavarman reasserted the Pallava supremacy over the Pudukkottai region some years after the battle of Kuḍamūkku or just after the battle of Arichit. As a result, the Muttaraiyars changed their allegiance again to the Pallavas. How long then they were feudatory to the Pallavas is not known. There is no evidence literary or epigraphical that can throw any light on the Muttaraiyars in the last quarter of the 9th century. Nevertheless, the gradual extension of Chōḷa influence into the Pudukkottai region as evidenced by the name of the Śiva temple at Nārttāmalai, Vijayālaya Chōḷīśvaram, and by the matrimonial alliance between the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs and Āditya I[3] and the speedy decline of the imperial power of the Pāṇḍyas after the battle of Śrīpurambiyam make it highly probable that the Muttaraiyars submitted to the growing power of the Chōḷas.

In fine, the great eclipse of the Chōḷa power after the Kaḷabhara interregnum and the long Chōḷa subordination to the Pallavas must be explained with particular reference to the Muttaraiya rule over portions of the Chōḷa country. In other words, the Muttaraiyars were a formidable obstacle to the rise of the Chōḷas. The removal of that obstacle in the middle of the 9th century ushered in an era of Chōḷa expansion. As long as the Muttaraiyars occupied a part of

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 63; 365 of 1904.
2. For a different reading of the inscription see *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 19.
3. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar - *Pirkala Cholar Charittiram.* Vol. I p. 32.

the Kāvēri region, the Pallavas had no serious trouble from the Chōḷas of the Tamil country. But, when the Muttaraiyars were dispossessed of it, the most fateful danger to the Pallava empire came from the Chōḷas.

Moreover, the Muttaraiya occupation of the borderland between the Pallava and Pāṇḍya empires was of great help to the Pallavas in combating the incursions of the Pāṇḍyas who were often assisted by the Chēras and the Koḍumbalūr chiefs. We have already noted the great services of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II alias Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ to the Pallava empire. It must be noted here that we do not have sufficient evidence to understand the role of other Muttaraiya chiefs in the long struggle between the Pāṇḍyas and the Pallavas.

We have some evidence testifying to the occasional Paṇḍya-Muttaraiya alliances, and perhaps one such alliance paved the way for the conquest of Tanjore by Vijayālaya. These alliances would have often weakened the Pallava hold on the Chōḷa country.

Feudatory Status:

The Muttaraiyars dated their inscriptions in the regnal years of their Pallava overlords and assumed the names and titles of the Pallava emperors. Thus, for instance, Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiyaṉ, the father of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II, was also known as Paramēśvaraṉ. As regards the titles Perumbiḍugu, Viḍēlviḍugu and Mārppiḍugu, these were borne by Pallava emperors[1] and were, as we have seen, assumed by their

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. I. p. 155; *S. I. I.* Vol. IV. No, 135 sect. J; *E. I.* Vol. XVIII. p. 122; *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 18; *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 158; *S. I. I.* Vol. III. No. 43 LL 20-21; *Nandikkalambagam*; 365 of 1904; 162 of 1912.

Muttaraiya vassals.[1] It must be noted that some Muttaraiya records, for example, the Śendalai records of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II and the Tirumayyam inscription of Viḍēlviḍugu Viḻuppēradi Araiśaṉ[2] are not dated in the regnal years of the Pallava emperors. But there is no doubt about the subordination to the Pallavas of the two Muttaraiya chiefs mentioned above, for their records mention their Pallava titles – a clear indication of subordination. Therefore this procedure appears to have been a privilege of powerful feudatories. The Muttaraiyars also fostered the village assemblies of their territory,[3] and, like the Banas, enjoyed a large measure of independence.

Constructive Work:

Some inscriptions throw light on the constructive work done by the Muttaraiyars. The Mārppiḍugu Peruṅgiṇaṟu at Tiruveḷḷaṟai was constructed by Kambaṉ Araiyaṉ in the fifth year of Pallavan Dantivarmaṉ.[4] Kambaṉ Araiyaṉ was probably a subordinate of Mārppiḍugu Pēradiyaraiyaṉ.[5] The

---

1. Mr. K. V. Subramanya Aiyar says that "there are not sufficient grounds at present to decide whether the Pallavas borrowed these titles from the Muttaraiyars or lent the same to the latter" (*E. I.* Vol XIII. p. 136). But the close resemblance between these titles and Pagāppiḍugu, one of the surnames of Mahēndravarmaṉ I, of which Mr. K. V. Subramanya Aiyar himself is aware, supports the latter probability.
2. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 13.
3. *Ibid.* No. 237; 14 of 1930–31.
4. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 158.
5. According to Dr. C. Minakshi, Kamban Araiyaṉ "was either a subject of the Muttaraiyar or a member of the Muttaraiyar family itself." *Administration and Social*

Great Well was probably named after the latter. "The shape of the well is that of a Svastika with four entrances and hence the present name 'nālumūlaikkēṇi'.... The size of the well suggests that it was used both for supplying water to the temple and for irrigating the dēvadāṉa lands near it."[1] A Chōḷa inscription from Ālambākkam (Lalgudi taluk, Trichinopoly district) refers to a tank called Mārppiḍugēri.[2] This tank also must have come into existence during the period of the same Muttaraiya chief, and was probably named after him.[3] An inscription of Pallava Dantivarmaṉ from Kuṉṉāṉḍārkōvil (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State) dated in his fifth year records that Vālivaḍugaṉ alias Kalimūrkka Iḷavaraiyaṉ, a subordinate of Mārppiḍugu Pēradiyaraiyaṉ, excavated a tank called Vāliēri.[4] It is difficult to identify the tank. An undated inscription from Nārttāmalai (Kulattur taluk) records the construction of a sluice by Tamiḻadiyaraiyaṉ alias Mallaṉ Viḍamaṉ for the tank called Aṉimadhaēri.[5] The Rāśāḷipaṭṭi inscription of Nandivarmaṉ II[6] dated in his twentyfifth year states that Pullaya Kaḍambaṉ, son of Āritham Pullaṉ, constructed a Kaṟkumiḻi (sluice or aqueduct)

Life under the Pallavas. p. 101). The word Araiyaṉ means something more than an ordinary subject. It denotes, for example, a subordinate with or without official status. The names of Kambaṉ Araiyaṉ and his brother Vijayanallūḻān are not like those of the Muttaraiyars. Therefore Kambaṉ Araiyaṉ could not be a member of the Muttaraiya famliy.

1. Dr. C. Minakshi. *Op. cit.* pp. 101–102.
2. 712 of 1909; *S. I. I.* Vol. XIII No. 222.
3. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 156.
4. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 17.
5. *Ibid.* No. 11.
6. *Ibid.* No. 16.

for a tank. Dr. C. Minakshi is inclined to take Kaṟkumiḻi to be a stone aqueduct rather than a sluice.[1] These evidences show that the Muttaraiyars realised the importance of irrigation.

Jainism under the Muttaraiyars:

Despite the vigorous growth of Saivism and Vaishṇavism, Jainism was still an important religion in the Chōḷa country. Like other feudatories of this period, the Muttaraiyars also extended their benefactions not only to the Śaivas and Vaishṇavas, but also to the Jains. The Jain poets who composed the Nāladiyār were probably patronised by the Muttaraiyars. This literary work makes specific reference to the high generosity of the Muttaraiyars.[2] It is not impossible that some Muttaraiya chiefs were followers of Jainism. The peculiar shape of the Mārpiḍugu Peruṅgiṇaṟu at Tiruveḷḷaṟai is worth noting. Mr. Mayilai Seeni Venkatasami says that the Svastik symbol is a Jain philosophic symbol and that it may be seen in Jain houses.[3] In that case, we may regard the builder of the Mārppiḍugu Peruṅgiṇaṟu or his feudal lord as a Jain. The Tamil verse of the Tiruveḷḷaṟai inscription of Dantivarmaṉ[4] seems to point to the same conclusion. Any casual reader of the Nālaḍiyār will not fail to note the striking

---

1. Dr. C. Minakshi. *Op. cit.* p. 105.
2. The *Nālaḍiyar*, poem No. 200·
   பெருமுத்தரையர் பெரிதுவந்தீயும்
   கருனைச்சோறுரர்வர் கயவர் ÷ கருனையைப்
   பேருமறியார் நனிவிரும்பு தாளாண்மை
   நீருமமிழ்தாய்விடும்."
3. Mayilai Seeni Venkatasami — *Samanamum Tamilum.* p. 16.
4. *E. I.* XI. p. 158.

similarity of ideas between it and the Tamil verse of the inscription mentioned above. It is not improbable that Tiruveḷḷaṟai was one of the early Jain settlements in the Tamil country.[1] It appears that there was a Jain colony very near Śendalai.[2] The name of Tirukkāṭṭuppaḷḷi, a village near Śendalai suggests that it must have been a Jain centre of learnining in the Muttaraiya period.[3] The discovery of an image of Mahavīra Tīrthaṅkara at Vishṇampēṭṭai, close to Tirukkāṭṭupaḷḷi, strengthens this view.[4]

Nārttāmalai (former Pudukkottai State) with Jain temples, monasteries, and schools was one of the most important Jain centres in the Tamil country. Dr. C. Minakshi discards the view that the Jains of Nārttāmalai came from Madura in the time of St. Sambandar.[5] The hills of Nārttā-malai, Mēlamalai, Kōṭṭaimalai, Kaḍambarmalai, Maṉmalai, Poṉmalai, Paraiyaṉmalai, Uvachchaṉmalai, Āḷuruṭṭimalai – were from very early times occupied by the Jains and were most suited to the Jain ideals of austere life and vigorous pursuit of studies. Dr. Minakshi refutes the identification Śamaṇarkuḍagu with the Vishṇu cave on the Mēlamalai and identifies it with a rock-cut cavern on the same hill above the Vishṇu cave.[6] Moreover, she says that the Jains must have utilized the Mēlamalai for their living and must have had the Āḷuruṭṭimalai as their place of worship and study. She thinks that in order to remove the Jains from this hill "the Śaiva devotees and the Viṣhṇu-bhaktas of the time of

---

1. See *I. A.* Vol. XXXIV. (1905) p. 264.
2. See S. R. Balasubramanyam. *Op. cit.,* p. V.
3. Paḷḷi means in Tamil a Jain school.
4. S. R. Balasubramanyam. *Op. cit.*
5. Dr. C. Minakshi. *Op. cit.*, p. 236.
6. *Ibid.*

Nṛipatuṅga excavated the two caves on this very hill."[1] But the date of the Vishṇu cave is uncertain. We have no concrete evidence for supposing that it came into existence during the reign of Nṛipatuṅga. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Aiyar, the editor of the Pudukkottai Manual (1944), is of opinion that the Vishṇu cave was originally a Jain temple and was converted into a Vishṇu temple in the 12th year (A. D. 1228) of Māṟavarmaṉ Śundarapāṇḍya I.[2] It is clear that there was a a Jain temple on the Āḷuruṭṭimalai.[3]

Śittaṉṉavāśal (former Pudukkottai State) was one of the well-known seats of Jain learning. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Aiyar says that it was never under the Pallavas.[4] But the presence of Muttaraiya inscriptions as far as Tirumayyam[5] in the south does not preclude the possibility that Śittaṉṉavāśal could have been under Muttaraiya influence at least for some time.

The rock-cut Jain temple and the old paintings here may be assigned to the epoch of Mahēndravarmaṉ. The new paintings that we now see at Śittaṉṉavāśal is assigned to the 9th century and is attributed to the Pāṇḍayas.[6] Dr. Minakshi, however, thinks that the Jain cave temple and its paintings must be the work of Mahēndravarmaṉ.[7] There is some indication that Aṉṉavāśal, near Śittaṉṉavāśal was once a Jain centre.[8]

---

1. *Ibid.* p. 237.
2. *M. P. S.* Vol. II. pt. II, p. 1072.
3. No. 158 of *I. P. S.*
4. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 347.
5. e. g., *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 13.
6. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXXIII. pp. 348–349.
7. Dr. C. Minakshi – *Op. cit.,* p. 234.
8. *M. P. S.* Vol. II. pt. ii, p. 1018.

Services to Saivism:

That many of the Muttaraiya chiefs adhered to Śavism and rendered remarkable services to its growth are clear from the epigraphical evidence at our disposal. A dateless Tamil inscription from Nārttāmali[1] states that the Śiva temple at Nārttāmalai (later known as Vijayālaya Chōḷiśvaram) was originally founded by Śāttaṉpūdi alias Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiyar, was destroyed by heavy rains and was renovated by Mallaṉ Viḍumaṉ alias Teṉṉavaṉ Tamiḷadiyaraiyaṉ. Śāttaṉpūdi, the original builder of the temple, was a subordinate of Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiyaṉ alias Paramēśvaraṉ, the father of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II. The later name of the temple viz., Vijayālaya Chōḷiśvaram suggests that the renovation noted in the record must have taken place in the time of the Chōḷa king Vijayālaya (*c.* A. D. 846–871).

The first of the Śendalai records of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II alias Śuvaraṉ Māraṉ[2] states that he built a Piḍāri temple. Where he built it is not mentioned in the record. A Pāṇḍya inscription[3] found on one of the Śendalai pillars records a gift of land to Mākāḷattu Piḍāri of Niyamam. Two other inscriptions found on the same place[4] register gifts of land to the same temple. These prove that there was a Piḍāri temple at Niyamam which is situated close to Śendalai. This was very probably the Piḍāri temple that was built by Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II.[5] The mutilation of the top portions of the Śendalai pillars and the presence on them of the inscriptions mentioned above lead one to believe that the

---

1. 216 of 1940–41.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. p. 139.
3. 10 of 1899.
4. 11 and 12 of 1899.
5. Paragraph 22 of *M. E. R.* 1899.

Śendalai pillars originally stood in the Piḍāri temple at Niyamam and were later brought to Śendalai for constructing a maṇḍapa in front of the Śundarēśvara temple at Śendalai.[1] The Malaiyaḍipaṭṭi inscription of Dantivarmaṉ dated in his sixteenth year[2] states that Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ alias Kuvāvaṉ Śāttaṉ scooped out Tiruvālattūrmalai into a temple later known as the Vāgīśvara temple and consecrated Bhaṭārar in it.[3] A Pāṇḍya inscription from Śendalai dated in the tenth year of Māṟañjaḍaiyaṉ (identifiable with Varaguṇa I) states that a servant of the Muttaraiya chief mentioned above made a gift of land for a lamp and daily offerings to Mākāḷattu Piḍari of Niyamam.[4] An undated inscription of Iḷaṅgō Muttaraiyars found in the Ōdanavaṉēśvara temple at Tiruchchāttuṟai (Tanjore taluk) registers a gift for burning a perpetual lamp.[5] Another inscription of the chief dated in his thirteenth year, found in the Tirukkōtīśvara temple at Tirukkōḍikāval (Kumbakonam taluk, Tanjore district) records a gift of sheep.[6] A third inscription of the same chief dated in the same regnal year, found in the Uttamanāthaśvami temple at Kīraṉūr (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State), seems to record gifts of land by the assembly of Kīraṉūr and by some private individuals for celebrating a festival in the temple of Uttamataṉi - Īśvarttu-Perumāṉaḍigaḷ of Kīraṉūr.[7]

---

1. *Ibid.*
2. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 18.
3. Bhaṭārar means God Siva.
4. 10 of 1899.
5. *S. I. I.* Vol. V. No. 618; 61 of 1895.
6. 39 of 1930–31.
7. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 237. The name of the Muttaraiya chief as given in the *C. L. I.* P. *S.* is Kōṉāḷaru Muttaraiyar. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Aiyar considers it an error and says that the correct reading is Iḷango Muttaraiyar. See *M.* P. *S.* Vol. II, pt. II, p. 1255.

Another record of the same chief dated in the same year found at Tiruchchennampūṇḍi (Tanjore taluk) records a gift of gold for a perpetual lamp.[1] A fifth inscription (duplicate copy) of the same chief dated in his seventeenth year found in the Tirukkōtīśvara temple at Tirukkōḍikāval registers a gift of gold for a lamp by Kaḷḷāṟṟūr Kandaṉpirāṭṭi of Kāraikkāḍu.[2]

A fragmentary inscription of Dantivarmaṉ from Piḷḷaipāḷayam (Kanchipuram taluk, Chingleput district) mentions a certain Kāḍuveṭṭi Muttaraiyaṉ at whose request an endowment of land was made to the old temple called Tirumēṟṟaḷi at Iraiyāñchēri and to a maṭha, probably attached to it.[3] The Tirumēṟṟaḷi temple is a Śiva temple. But Mr. V. Venkatasubba Aiyar regards it as a Vishṇu temple..[4] This is untenable because St. Appar had sung in honour of the God of Tirumēṟṟaḷi.[5] "It is not unlikely that the Tirumēṟṟaḷi maṭha existed as early as the time of Mahēndravarmaṉ I, for it seems it was the presence of the maṭha that inspired St. Appar (Tirunavukkarasar) to glorify Kāñchī as a great seat of learning in this particular padigam."[6]

As regards Kāḍuveṭṭi Muttaraiyaṉ, he seems to have been a Muttaraiya officer of the Pallava emperor. It is doubtful if he belonged to the main line of the Muttaraiya chiefs. Mr. V. Venktasubba Aiyar identifies him with

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. VII. No. 529; 303 of 1901.
2. 14 of 1930–31.
3. 89 of 1921; *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 44.
4. See Intro. to No. 44 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XII.
5. See the Fourth Tirumaṟai–Tirukkachchimēṟṟaḷi.
6. "Kalviyaikkaraiyilāda Kāñchimānagar – Tirumēṟṟaḷi padigam" — Dr. C. Minakshi. Op. cit. p. 208.

Kāḍuveṭṭi Muttaraśaṉ, a Noḷamba general, who figures in a record from Punganur.[1] But this is unwarranted.

An undated inscription from Kuṉṉaṇḍārkōvil records a gift of rice by a certain .kōḍai Mayindaṉ for feeding 110 Brāhmaṇs during the Ārdrā festival of Tirukkuṉṟakkuḍittēvar.[2] Another inscription from the same place dated in the third year of Nandipōttaraiyar III records a gift of rice for feeding hundred persons on the day of Tiruvādirai by Gaṉavatimāṉ alias Pagaichchandra Visaiyaraiyaṉ of Vaḍuvūr in Mīpuḷa-nāḍu.[3]

The Nārttāmalai inscription of Nṛipatuṅga dated in his seventh year states that Śāttaṉ Paḷiyili excavated the rock-cut Śiva temple at Nārttāmalai, that his daughter Paḷiyili Sṛiya-Naṅgai, the wife of Mīṉavaṉ Tamiḷadiyaraiyaṉ alias Pallaṉ Anantaṉ, enlarged it by adding a *mukhamaṇḍapa*, a *balipītha*, a *ṛishaba* and a *ṛishabamaṇḍapa* and that she made provision for worship and offerings to the God of Paḷiyilīśvaram temple.[4] Obviously, the temple was named after its builder who was a probable contemporary of Nandivarmaṉ III. It may be noted in passing that there is an altar to Vallavaṭṭi-amman at Semmaṭṭiviḍuti (Alangudi taluk, former Pudukkottai State). The Goddess is believed to have come from Vallam in the Tanjore district.[5]

Aṉṉavāśal is mentioned in one of the hymns of St. Tirunavukkaraśar and this shows that there was an old Śiva

---

1. Intro. to No. 44 of *S.* I. I. Vol. XII.
2. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 8.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 46; 347 of 1914.
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 63.
5. *M. P. S.* Vol. II, pt. II, p. 997.

temple here in the seventh century.[1] It is likely that the rock-cut Śiva temple at Kuṉṉāṇḍārkōvil was built by the Muttaraiyars. It is possible that the rock-cut Śiva temple at Devarmalai (Tirumayyam taluk, former Pudukkottai State) came into existence during the Muttaraiya period.[2]

Vaishṇavism under the Muttaraiyars :

The Bakti cult of Vaishṇavism represented by the Āḻvārs in the Tamil country during the period under consideration did not fail to influence the Muttaraiyars. An undated inscription found in the Śatyagiṟinātha Perumāḷ temple at Tirumayyam states that Perumbiḍugu Perundēvi, the mother of Viḍēlviḍugu Viḻupperadi-Araiśaṉ alias Śāttaṉ Māṟaṉ, repaired the temple and granted a village.[3] Perumbiḍugu Perundēvi of this inscription may be identified with the queen of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II alias Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ.[4] It may be noted that the hymns of Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār refer to this temple.[5] The rock-cut Vishṇu temple at Malayaḍipaṭṭi (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State) was probably excavated in the first half of the ninth century. It is not known whether it was excavated by the Muttaraiyars or by some other chiefs.

An incomplete inscription from Tirumukkūḍal (Kanchipuram taluk) dated in the twenty-fourth year of Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṉ states that the assembly of Śīyapuram in Ūṟṟukkaṭṭukkōṭṭam

1. *Ibid.* p. 1018.
2. *Ibid.* pp. 1136 & 1137.
3. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 13; 402 of 1906.
4. *E. I.* Vol. XIII p. 138.
5. *Tirukkuruntaṇḍakam* poem No. 19; *Periyatirumoḻi* III - vi - v. 9; VI - ix - v. 7; VIII - iii v. 3; IX - iii - v. 3; X - ii - v. 5; XI - vii - v. 5.

agreed to maintain a perpetual lamp in the temple of Vishṇu-bhaṭāra at Tirumukkūḍal for the interest on 30 kaḷañju of gold received by them from Arigaṇḍa Perumāṇār, son of Kāḍupaṭṭi Muttaraiyar.[1] It is doubtful whether Kāḍupaṭṭi Muttaraiyar of this inscription is identical with the person of the same name who figures in a record[2] mentioned above.

One more point to be considered in this section is about Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār. Pandit M. Raghavaiyangar thinks that Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār who belonged to the Kaḷvar community was a Muttaraiya chief ruling over Tiruvāli-nāḍu probably in subjection to the Chōḷas.[3] But this is not corroborated by any evidence literary or epigraphical. The *Guruparampara* is far from confirming it.

It is significant that in an age of great religious upheaval, the Muttaraiyars exhibited in religion a broad outlook by tolerating and patronising different denominations.

Patronage of Tamil Literature:

The history of Tamil literature during the seventh century is comparatively obscure. But in the following century, we find the Muttaraiyars figuring as the greatest feudatory patrons of Tamil literature. The court of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ alias Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ was adorned by a number of poets such as Vēḷnambaṉ of Pāchchil, Āchāryar Aniruddar, Iḷamperumāṉār of Kōṭṭāṟu and Amaruṇṇilai of Pavadāyamaṅgalam. Their poems are found on four pillars in the Śundarēśvara temple at Śendalai.[4] Vēḷnambaṉ was a native

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 75; 179 of 1915.
2. 89 of 1921.
3. M. Raghavaiyangar – *Āḻvārgaḷ. Kālanilai.* p. 122.
4. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. pp. 139-149.

of Tiruppāchchil (āchchiramam) in the Maḻanāḍu of the Chōḷa country.[1] It is possible that this poet belonged to the community of Vēḷir chiefs.[2] Pandit M. Raghavaiyangar says that Āchāryar Aniruddar must have been either a teacher of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II or a Jain preceptor.[3] The third poet Kōṭṭaṟu Iḷamperumāṉār was a native of Kōṭṭaṟu. But Raghavaiyangar's identification of Kōṭṭāṟu with Nagercoil (T. C. State) is not satisfactory. Kōṭṭāṟu must be identified with some place in the Tanjore or Trichinopoly district possiby with Koṭṭāttūr in Musiri taluk. The fourth poet Amaruṉṉilai alias Kuvāvaṅg Kāñjaṉ came from Pavadāya-maṅgalam which belonged to Kiḻār Kūṟṟam of the Chōḷa country. It is doubtful if he occupied any military position as Raghavaiyangar thinks[4]

These poets composed their beautiful verses in praise of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II alias Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ. The verses are in Veṇbā and Kaṭṭaḷaikkalitturai metres. Of the twenty-seven poems found on the Śendalai pillars, many are fragmentary and the remaining complete poems are of high quality.

The *Yāpparuṅgalam* (Virutti), a Tamil work on grammar, composed by Amritasākaraṉār "some time towards the close of the tenth century"[5] mentions a literary work called *Tamiḻ-muttaraiyarkōvai.* Nothing more than the name of the work

---

1. See T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar's article on *Kalveṭṭāl Ariyappaḍum Pulavargaḷ in 'Sentamiḻ.'* Vol. XXIX. p. 295.
2. M. Raghavaiyangar *Śāsanat - Tamil Kavi Charitam.* p.11
3. *Ibid.* p. 19.
4. *Ibid.* p. 20.
5. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *The Colas* p. 682.

is at present known.[1] It is not unlikely that it was composed in the time of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II alias Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ.

The Nālaḍiyār's references to the Muttaraiyars (v v 200 and 206) deserve careful examination. Dr. G. U. Pope, who translated the work into English, does not give any date for it, but simply says 'that the seventh century A. D. .... saw the beginning of Tamil literature under Jain auspices.[2] Mr. K. S. Srinivasa Pillai says that it is worth-considering whether the Nālaḍiyar was composed in the fifth century A. D., when the Jain Tamil Saṅgam at Madurai was established by Vajranandi.[3] Dr. M. Rajamanikkam thinks that the work may be assigned to the fifth century.[4] Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar assigns the Nālaḍiyār to the eighth century A. D. on the ground that no available record of the Muttaraiyars can be assigned to a period earlier than the eighth century.[5] This view is highly probable and is in consonance with our view that the rise of the Muttaraiyar in the Chōḻa country may be roughly dated from the latter half of the seventh century. It is not impossible that the Nālaḍiyār was composed in the time of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II. It is also known as Nālaḍi Nāṉūṟu ('Four Hundred Quatrains') and Veḷḷāḷar Vēdam ('The Bible of the Cultivators of the Soil'). It deals with the ethical and social philosophy of the Tamil people and occupies a position next only to the Kuṟaḷ. "Though composed most probably by Jains, it contains

1. *Yapparungalam;* the chapter on 'Oḻipiyal', p. 486.
2. Intro. to the Nālaḍiyār p. X.
3. *Tamil Varalāṟu* Vol. I. pt. II, p. 44 (1949).
4. *Pallavar Varalāṟu.* p. 43.
5. *Tamil Ilakkiya Varalāṟu.* (250–600) pp. 72 & 73.

scarcely any traces of their peculiar tenets."[1] All the poems are composed in veṉbā metre and are noted for the terseness and vigour of their style. The echoes of the ideas of the Nāladiyār can be very well seen in the Tamil verse of the Tiruveḷḷaṟai inscription of Dantivarmaṉ.[2]

Contribution to Architecture and Sculpture:

We have already seen how the Śiva temple at Nārttāmalai (later known as Vijayālaya Chōḷīśvaram) was originally founded by Śāttaṉpūdi alias Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiyaṉ a subordinate of Māṟaṉ Paramēśvaraṉ alias Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiyaṉ. Subsequently, the temple was ruined by heavy rains and was repaired by Mallaṉ Viḍumaṉ probably in the time of the Chōḷa king Vijayālaya, as the present name of the temple suggests.[3] One of the Śendalai records of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II alias Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ states[4] that he built a temple for Goddess Piḍāri. We have already seen that the temple must have been built at Niyamam and not at Śendalai. An undated inscription of Viḍēlviḍugu Viḷuppēradi-Araiśaṉ alias Śāttaṉ Māṟaṉ found in the Śatyagiṟinātha Perumāḷ temple at Tirumayyam states that his mother repaired the temple and granted a village.[5] This is a "rock-cut shrine containing the Yōgaśayanamūrthi or the God in a recumbent posture......... The main idol is an imposing sculpture lying on a serpent couch; the five hoods of the serpent, which cover the God's head as a canopy, are half-drawn backward. The God has two arms, one stretched behind him as if comforting

---

1. G. U. Pope. *Op. cit.* p. VIII.
2. *E. I.* Vol XI. p. 158.
3. 216 of 1940-41.
4. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. p. 139.
5. *C. L. I. P. S.* No. 13.

the serpent Ādiseṣa, and the other represented as protecting Lakṣimī who is seated on his breast."[1] The main idol is surrounded by a number of sculptures representing minor deities. This shrine may be assigned to the middle of the eighth century A. D.[2] The songs of Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār in honour of the Śatyagirinātha Perumāḷ of Tirumayyam,[3] testify to the antiquity of the temple. An inscription of Dantivarmaṉ from Malayaḍipaṭṭi (Kulattur taluk, former Pudukkottai State) dated in his sixteenth year states that Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ alias Kuvāvaṉ Śāttaṉ scooped out Tiruvālattūrmalai into a temple and consecrated Bhaṭārar in it.[4] This temple exhibits some features of the Mahēndra style of architecture. "The upper and lower parts of the massive pillars are cubical while the middle is octagonal. The front half of the cave is a hall of the rock-cut shrine running east to west, while the rear half has a square cell, wherein is the *liṅgam* with a sort of *ardhamaṇṭapam* in front, wherein, the *nandi* is placed on a pedestal. On the walls are panels with figures in bas-relief including the Saptamātrikā group, Gaṇēśa, Vīrabhadra, Śiva, Viṣhṇu and Mahiṣāśuramardani. The Durgā or Mahiṣāśuramardani panel is of particular interest; and the Goddess here as at the Seven Pagodas is represented with a benign countenance eight-armed, astride on her lion, and aiming a spear at the Asura. The dvārapālakas are, like all Pallava dvārapālakas, two armed. One of them bears a bull's horn and a coronet. Evidently this figure represents a person of rank probably the chief who

1. *M.* P. *S.* Vol. II, pt. II. p. 1210.
2. Slightly different is the view of Mr. K: R. Venkatarama Aiyar. See Ibid. p. 1211.
3. *Op. cit.*
4. *C L I P S* No. 18

built the shrine."[1] This temple came into existence sometime towards the close of the eighth century A. D.

The Nārttāmalai inscription of Nṛipatugṅa dated in his seventh year[2] states that Śāttaṉ Paḻiyili, son of Viḍēlviḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ excavated the rock-cut temple called Paḻiyili-Īśvaram and that his daughter enlarged it by adding a *mukhamaṇḍpa, balipīta, ṛishaba* and a *ṛishabamaṇḍapa.*[3] Paḻiyili Īśvaram is a small Śiva temple having "only a *garbha-graham*........ In front of it there is a moulded basement with a moulded beading above and frieze of dancing bhūtagaṇas. A cylindrical *liṅgam* and two *dvārapālakas* .... belonging to this temple have now been excavated."[4] It seems that the other parts of the temple mentioned in the inscription are ruined. This temple may be assigned to the second quarter of the ninth century A. D. for Śāttaṉ Paḻiyili was a probable contemporary of Nandivarmaṉ III.

The Pushpavaṉēśvara cave temple at Pūvaḷaikkuḍi (Tirumayyam taluk, former Pudukkottai State) was excavated probably by Pūdikaḷari alias Amaruṉṟi Muttaraiyaṉ who is mentioned in a fragmentary record found in the same temple.[5] He is identified with Iḷaṅgōvadiyaraiyaṉ alias Māṟaṉ Paramēśvaraṉ, and with his son Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II.[6]

---

1. *M. P. S.* Vol. II. pt. II. pp. 1059–60.
2. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 63.
3. For a different interpretation see *C L I P S* No. 19. According to it a son of Śāttaṉ Paḻiyili constructed the *mukhamaṇḍapa* and consecrated the bull with its *maṇḍapa,* and also the Balipīta. This statement is based on the wrong reading of the record.
4. *M. P. S.* Vol. II, pt. II. p. 1071.
5. 142 of 1907.
6. *M. P. S.* Vol. II. II, pt. II. pp. 1188 and 1254.

This seems to be improbable, for the Śendalai records do not mention the names Pūdikaḷari and Amaruṉṟi. It is likely that the chief bearing the two names was a subordinate of the Muttaraiyars. Or, in the alternative, he may have been a predecessor of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ I. "The Puṣpavaṉēśvara temple consists of a cubical rock-cut cell which is the sanctum, with an entrance in front. There are shallow niches flanked by pilasters on either side of the entrance, carrying bevelled corbels. The *arthamaṇṭapam* is structural"[1] and belongs to a later period.

It is possible that the rock-cut Śiva temple at Kuṉṉāṇḍārkōvil was built by the Muttaraiyars.[2] It is similar in plan to the Gōkarṇēśvara temple at Tirugōkarṇam (Alangudi taluk, former Pudukkottai State), and contains a Valamburi Gaṇēśa and a Sōmāskanda group. The two dvārapālakas found here are regarded as portrait sculptures. One of them found on the southern side is believed to be the portrait either of a Pallava king or of a Muttaraiya vassal. The other is taken to be "that of a noble man, probably the governor of the nādu, and his features exhibit humility and reverence."[3]

It is suggested that the rock-cut temple at Dēvarmalai (Tirumayyam taluk, former Pudukkottai State) may be ascribed to the Muttaraiya chiefs.[4] This temple contains some notable sculptures. One of them represents "a chief in regal robes with one hand placed on the hip and the other raised in adoration."[5]

1. *Ibid.* p. 1187–88.
2. See *Ibid.* p. 1054.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.* p. 1137.
5. *Ibid.* p. 1136.

The other two are taken to be those of saints one of which is believed to be that of Perumiḻalai Kuṟumba Nāyaṉār. But this is very doubtful. There is also a Valamburi Gaṇēśa, and the *liṅgam* here is placed on a square Yōṇipītam. There are later additions to this temple.[1]

We have already dealt with the Jain monuments at Śittaṉṉavāśal. There are some other rock-cut temples in the former Pudukkottai State which can be assigned to the Pallava period. These are the Gōkarṇēśvara temple at Tirugōkarṇam, the Vishṇu temples at Malayaḍipaṭṭi and Nārttāmalai, and the Śiva temples at Malayakkōvil. The architectural features of these temples do not help us in determining their dates. No evidence is at present available in respect of their builders. Nevertheless, it is not unlikely that some, though not all, of them owed their existence to the Muttaraiyars.

---

1. *Ibid.*

A NOTE ON THE ORIGIN OF THE MUTTARAIYARS

There are different views regarding the origin of the Muttaraiyars. Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar regards the Muttaraiyars as a branch of the Kaḷabhras.[1] Mr. M. Raghavaiyangar, who rejects the view on the ground that the Muttaraiyars were subordinate to the Pallavas while the Kaḷabhras were hostile to the Pallava dynasty till the time of Nandivarmaṉ II, does not say anything about the origin of the Muttaraiyars.[2] The absence of any reference to them in the literary works of the Saṅgam period may be taken to indicate that they were not in the Tamil country in the Saṅgam period. According to latest researches, as we have already noted, the Nāladiyar which mentions the Muttariyars is assigned to the 8th century A. D. and thus excluded from the Saṅgam anthologies.[3] The fact that the Pallava king Simhavishṇu is not stated in any record to have come into conflict with the Muttaraiyars is of some significance. The lithic records of Mahēndravarmnṉ I found in the chōḷa country do not allude to the Muttaraiyars. In short, the earliest known records of the Muttaraiyars are those of Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II alias Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ who belongs to the first half of the 8th century and any history of the Muttaraiyars based on those records cannot go back by more than fifty years. In the light of these data, we may state that the Muttaraiya occupation of the Kāvērī region is not likely to have taken place prior to the time of Pallava Mahēndravarmaṉ. In that case, the next thing that has to be examined is who the Muttaraiyars were? The fact that the liberality of

1. R. Gopalan. *The Pallavas.* Intro. p. XXIII.
2. *J. I. H.* Vol. VIII. p. 75.
3. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar - *Tamiḻ Ilakkiya Varalāṟu.* p 73.

the Muttaraiyars is eulogistically referred to in the Nālaḍiyār makes it probable that it was composed under the patronage of the Muttaraiyars. Still G. U. Pope and Mr. V. Venkayya refer to a tradition according to which the Nālaḍiyar was composed by some Jain poets who were for sometime under the patronage of a Pāṇḍya monarch.[1] But not even a single reference to the Pāṇḍyas is found in the Nālaḍiyār. There is no possibility of identifying the Muttaraiyars with the Pāṇḍyas. May it be that the early Muttaraiya chiefs regarded themselves as rulers of the Pāṇḍya country in spite of the fact that they were not in possession of it? The fact that Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II and his predecessors had such surnames as Māṟaṉ, Neḍumāṟan and Śrīmāṟaṉ renders our view possible. The interpretation of the term Muttaraiya as lord of the land of pearls[2] indicates that the Muttaraiyars had some connections with the Pāṇḍya country.[3] If this surmise is accepted, we may conclude that the Muttaraiyars were a branch of the Kaḷabhras and held the Pāṇḍya country during what is known as Kaḷabhra interregnum. It seems quite possible that some time after the overthrow of their rule by Kaḍuṅgōṉ, the Kaḷabhras of the Pāṇḍya country, later called Muttaraiyars, sought their fortune in the Kāvērī region where the princes of the Chōḷa line were maintaining their feeble authority in limited areas. The theory that the Kaḷabhras were identical with the Kaḷvar supports our conclusion for one of the Śendalai inscriptions describes

---

1. *The Nālaḍ*iyār, Intro. pp. 7–9; *A. S. I.* 1905–06. p. 178. F. n. 1.
2. See Dr. M. Rajamanickam - *Pallavar Varalāṟu.* p. 43.
3. For a different interpretation of the term see M. S. Ramaswami Aiyangar – *Studies in South Indian Jainism.*

Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ as Kaḷvarakaḷvaṉ.[1] The Kaḷabhra enemies of Nandivarmaṉ II mentioned in the Koṟṟamaṅgalam plates must be the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs who were another branch of the Kaḷabhras and who were hostile to the Pallavas.

On the identity of the terms Mutturāju and Muttaraiyar, Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri and M. Venkataramayya take the view that the Muttaraiyars were Pallava princes.[2] But there is no clear evidence for identifying the Muttaraiyars with the Pallavas. The suffix of the names of all Pallava princes after Simhavishṇu is 'varmaṉ'. This we do not find in the names proper of the Muttaraiyars. Moreover, the records of the Muttaraiyars do not hint at the view that they were of Pallava extraction. Therefore this view is quite improbable.

---

1. *E. I.* XIII. p. 143.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 223.

III

THE KOḌUMBĀḶŪR CHIEFS (*c.* A.D. 600 – *c.* 900):

The Vēḷir chiefs of Koḍumbāḷūr were another great feudatory dynasty of South India. We have only a few records about this dynasty. Of them, the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription of Bhūti Vikramakēsari (C. L. I. P. S. No. 14), which gives in some detail the genealogy of his line, is very important. The beginning and end of the record are mutilated; the language is Sanskrit and the script Grantha. The inscription is open to different interpretations and its date is still discussed. In order to understand clearly the different points of view in regard to its interpretation, a translation of it is given below.

"There was .... the capturer of the herd of elephants of the lord ....

"Of his family was Pravīrajit; the glorious Vīratuṅga, the vanquisher of the Maḷava, was born of him; from him came Ativīra Anupamā who gave birth to Saṅghakṛt; from him (came) the glorious Nṛpakēsari (Lion of kings) who as a child grew up with the serpents; his son was the celebrated Paradurgamardana (the destroyer of enemy forts), the conqueror of Vātāpi.

"Of him who had a divine splendour, Samarābhirāma (delightful in battle) was the son who attacked (or killed) the Caḷukki in the battle of Adhirājamaṅgala.

"Of him, who was the banner of the Yaduvaṁśa, Anupamā (peerless) rightly so called, the daughter of the Cōḷa King, was the beloved (wife), who resembled Lakṣmī

(the wife) of Viṣṇu, Sarasvatī of the Lotus-born (Brahmā), and Girijā (Mountain-born) of Hara himself.

"Of her was born to him the glorious King Bhūti, who bore the alternative name Minnāmalā (?) and who earned in war the title of Vikramakēsari (the lion of valour).

"The water of the Kāvēri was turned red with blood of the Pallava forces; and this warrior defeated Vīrapāṇḍya in battle and became death to Vañcivēḷ.

"After fighting the rutting elephants, viz., his foes, Vikramakēsari was living in the palace on the hill in the city of Koḍumbāḷūr.

"While the earth was ruled by him, the Kalpataru to the learned, the moon to the lotuses. viz., the two hands of the (subordinate) kings (i.e., they closed their palms together in salutation) and the beloved of the goddesses of Earth, Victory, Prosperity, Fame and Speech, Sharpness was found (only) in the pair of eyes, instability in the two eyelashes and darkness in the hair (of women); weakness in their bodies; and jostling in the pair of (their) breasts."

"He had two good wives called Kaṟṟaḷi and Varaguṇā (and) Kaṟṟaḷi became the mother of two very beautiful (sons) Parāntaka and Ādityavarman."

"There was the glorious Mallikārjuna, born of the Ātrēyagōtra, a resident of Mathura, the master of the Vēda and the pupil of Vidyārāśi, the abode of austerity."

"Having raised the three Vimānas in his name and in the name of his two wives and having enshrined Mahēśvara, he (Vikramakēsari) gave to him (Mallikārjuna) a big maṭha."

"The Yādava gave to that ascetic chief of the Kāḷamukha persuasion a big maṭha together with eleven villages attached to it."

"For the enjoyment of fifty Asita-Vaktra (Kāḷamukha) ascetics the big maṭha .... that King .... offerings, sandals, flowers, akṣata, dhūpa, dīpa, tām(būla), ...[1]

Our purpose here is to examine whether the inscription belongs to the Pallava period or not. Fr. Heras assigns the inscription to the latter half of the seventh century A. D. on the ground that Bhūti Vikramakēsari who issued the record belonged to that period. His analysis of the date of Vikramakēsari is as follows. He states that "if the opinions of Mr. Radhakrishna Aiyar or Prof. Nilakanta Sastri, saying that Bhūti Vikramakēsarī lived towards the close of the ninth century or during the tenth century, were true, then his father Samarābhirāma must be placed about the middle of the 9th century or the beginning of the tenth. Now the Chalukya Empire was finally overrun by the Rāṣṭrakūtas shortly after the middle of the eighth century. Samarābhirāma could hardly have killed the Chalukya Emperor when the Chalukya Empire did not exist any more."[2] He regards Prof. Sastri's view about the possible existence of Chāḷukya chiefs at Vātāpi

1. Taken from Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri's article on '*The Koḍumbāḷūr Inscription of Bhūti Vikramakēsari*' (*J. O. R.* Vol. VII. 1933, pp. 9 and 10). It may be noted that according to Venkayya the beginning of the inscription refers to the "vanquisher of the Pāṇḍya elephants" whose name is lost. (Paragraph 85 of *M. E. R.* 1908). But the name, Pāṇḍya is not seen in Prof. K. A. N. Sastri's edition.

2. *J. R. A. S.* 1934. pp. 34–35.

under the Rāshṭrakūṭas as absolutely improbable and unwarranted.[1] In Fr. Heras's opinion, the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs were feudatory to Pallava Mahēndravarmaṉ I and his son Narasimhavarmaṉ I and took part in the Pallava expedition to Vātāpi. In other words, Fr. Heras thinks that the conquest of Vātāpi mentioned in the Koḍumbāḷūr record is no other than the conquest of Vātāpi effected by Narasimhavarmaṉ I and that Paradurgamardana claims for himself the laurels obtained on the battle-field while fighting under his overlord.[2] In order to strengthen his view, the same scholar identifies Paradurgamardana with one of the three kings who, according to the Kurnool plates of Vikramāditya I[3] defeated Pulikēśin II.

Samarābirāma, who claims to have defeated or killed a Chāḷukya at the battle of Adhirājamaṅgala, is supposed by Fr. Heras to have borne a conspicuous part in the war between Pulikēśin II and Narasimhavarmaṉ I. The same scholar thinks that the battle at Adhirājamaṅgala mentioned in the Koḍumbāḷūr record may be identified with the battle of Maṇimaṅgala, mentioned in the Kūram plates of Paramēśvaravarmaṉ I.[4] "Indeed, there is nothing far-fetched in the supposition that Samarābhirāma, as heir apparent, accompanied his father in the war of the Pallavas against the Chalukyas, and that in the midst of the turmoil of battle, he was fortunate enough to find himself in the face of the Chalukya monarch, near enough to deal him a death-stroke."[5] This achievement of Samarābhirāma as crown-prince is stated

1. *Ibid.*
2. *Ibid.* p. 36.
3. *J. B. B. R. A. S.* XVI. p. 226.
4. *J. R. A. S.* 1934. p. 37.
5. *Ibid.* p. 38.

to have been mentioned under his name as king.[1] Long before Fr. Heras, Mr. S. M. Edwardes, expressed the same views about the achievements of Paradurgamardana and his son, Samarābhirāma.[2]

The chronology of the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs is fixed by Fr. Heras as follows:

" A. D. 630	—	Reign of Paradurgamardana (continued).
A. D. 640-2	—	Probable death of Pāradurgamardana and beginning of reign of Samarābhirāma.
A. D. 665-7	—	Probable end of reign of Samarābhirāma and beginning of reign of Bhūti Vikramakēsarī."[3]

Fr. Heras then proceeds to determine the date when Bhūti Vikramakēsari came into conflict with the Pallavas and the Pāṇḍyas. He states that the Chōḷa power was revived in the latter half of the seventh century A. D. by Kō-cheṅgaṇāṉ, who is described by Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār as "the vanquisher of the southern king and the lords of Kuḍagu, koṅgu and the lord of the Southern Tamil country and the Northern King," that the matrimonial alliance between the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs and the Chōḷas of this period greatly contributed to it and that Bhūti Vikramakēsari was a subordinate of Kō-cheṅgaṇāṉ and helped the Chōḷa king in defeating the Pallavas and the Pāṇḍyas. Vikramakēsari's campaigns against the Pallavas,

---

1. *Ibid.*
2. See Mr. Edwards's article on '*The Kannaḍa poets*'. *I. A.* Vol. 55 (1926) p. 72.
3. *J. R. A. S.*, 1934, p. 41.

the Pāṇḍyas and the Vañjivēḷs are thus taken to be the same as those of Kō-cheṅgaṇāṉ. The existence in the Chōḷa country of Pallava inscriptions of the 8th and 9th centuries is considered as indicating the serious set-backs experienced by the Chōḷas and the re-establishment of Pallava supremacy in the Chōḷa country in the regin of Nandivarmaṉ II Pallavamalla.[2]

As regards the architecture of the Mūvarkōvil temple (at Koḍumbāḷūr), Fr. Heras remarks as follows: "The only serious objection against our views as regards this Koḍumbāḷūr chronology is archaeological. The temples of Koḍumbāḷūr built by Bhūti Vikramakēsari seem to belong to a much later period. The general style of the temples, the technique of the sculpture and the system of construction appear Chōḷa rather than Pallava, and look more of the tenth century than of the seventh. Yet between this objection and the objection of the capture of Bādāmi and the slaying of the Chalukya king in the ninth or tenth centuries, the former seems to be more easily solved. As a matter of fact, the Koḍumbāḷūr temples may be classified as an "archaeological puzzle" or as "an architectural phenomenon." If those temples are finally placed in the tenth or even in the eleventh century, you will still have the square cupola-like umbrella of the top of the vimāna – without precedent and without consequent, totally unique in South Indian architecture – without a satisfactory explanation. Bhūti Vikramakēsarī or his architect or perhaps both, were geniuses much beyond their age. Had the style of Koḍumbāḷūr found followers, a new style of architecture would have existed in South India. But now the temples are like an isolated instance of the work of a genius that found no followers."[1]

1. *Ibid.* pp. 42–44.
2. *Ibid.* p. 38, Foot-note No. 3.

Fr. Heras's interpretation of the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription requires careful examination. If Samarābhirāma was really the slayer of Pulikēśin II, he would have been so mentioned in the Koḍumbāḷūr record. Bhūti Vikramakēsari could not have forgotten such a great achievement of his father. The confirmatory evidence, which Fr. Heras cites in support of his view, is far from being satisfactory.

Fr. Heras's view that Bhūti Vikramakēsari was a contemporary of Kō-cheṅgaṇāṉ is based on slippery ground, for the date of Kō-cheṅgaṇāṉ is still debated. Prof. Nilakanta Sastri[1] and Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar[2] assign this Chōḷa king to the Saṅgam period. Dr. Rajamanikkam says that Kō-cheṅgaṇāṉ belongs to the middle of the 5th century A. D.[3] If Kō-cheṅgaṇāṉ lived in the seventh century A. D. and if he was so great a monarch as Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār describes, he would have certainly left at least a few stone records. But, to our great surprise, nothing has come down to us. In brief, Fr. Heras's account of the resuscitation of the Chōḷa power in the latter half of the seventh century requires clear evidence.[4]

Fr. Heras has failed to identify Vīrapāṇḍya who is mentioned in the Koḍumbāḷūr record. Nor does he gave any explanation regarding the mention in the tenth century Chōḷa records of the names of the two queens of Bhūti Vikramakēsari, Varaguṇa and Kaṟṟaḷi.

Mr. S. R. Balasubramanyam and Mr. K. Venkataranga Raju do not accept Fr. Heras's views about the *vimāna* of the

---

1. *The Cōḷas*. pp. 51–53.
2. *Tamil Ilakkiya Varal*āṟu (250–600 A. D.), p. 72.
3. *Periyapur*āṇ*a* Āraichchi. p. 94.
4. See *J. R. A. S.* 1935, pp. 480 and 481.

Mūvarkōvil temple. According to them "the Kodumbāḷūr vimāna is not an isolated and unique work of a genius, but it has precedents and consequents. It will be seen that the Śikharas of Kāḷiyapaṭṭi, Koḍumbāḷūr, Ēṉādi, Tirukkaṭṭalai, Tiruppūr, Viśalūr and we may add even the distant Saṅgamēśvara temple at Paṭṭāḍakkal, of perhaps the 8th century – are very similar."[1]

Dr M. Arokiaswami, who concurs with Fr. Heras in interpreting the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription, suggests that Vīrapāṇḍya, who was defeated by Vikramakēsari, may be identified with Arikēsarivarmaṉ (*c.* A.D. 670–*c.*710).[2] But it is not known whether Arikēsarivarmaṉ had the title, Vīrapāṇḍya.

It is, therefore, not possible to assign the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription to the seventh century A. D.

Mr. S. M. Edwardes holds a slightly different view. According to him, the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription of Vikramakēsari is assignable to the eighth century, for, Vidyārāsi of this record is identical with the Śaiva preceptor of the same name mentioned in a Tagaḍūr inscription[3] which cannot be of later date than the eighth century.[4] The date of the Tagaḍūr inscription is based on the ground that it contains old Kannaḍa terminations such as "baredon vannipom, bannipom." Obviously, the conclusion is based on doubtful linguistic data and can be hardly regarded as final. Naturally, Edwardes's date for the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription is very doubtful.

---

1. *J. O. R.* Vol. XII. (1938). p. 69.
2. *The Early History of the Veḷḷār Basin.* p. 86.
3. 309 of 1901.
4. *I. A.* Vol. 55 (1926). pp. 72–73.

On the other hand, Mr. V. Venkayya refers the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription to the first half of the tenth century stating that the script of it belongs to that period and that Vīrapāṇḍya, who was overcome by Bhūti Vikramakēsari, is identical with Vīrapāṇḍya with whom the Chōḷa king Āditya II Karikāla, son of Śundara Chōḷa fought in his youth.[1] The Epigraphist refers to a Rājakēsari inscription from Tiruppalātturai (Trichinopoly district) which mentions Kaṟṟaḷipiraṭṭi,[2] one of the wives of Bhūti Vikramakēsari.[3]

In his learned article on the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription,[4] Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri accepts Venkayya's date for the record and furnishes some additional details in support of his view. He considers at some length the relations between the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs and Chōḷas of Vijayālaya line and comes to the conclusion that Bhūti Vikramakēsari was a subordinate of Śundara Choḷa Parāntaka II (A. D. 956–70) and his son Āditya II Karikāla. The naming of Vikramakēsari's sons after Parāntaka II and Āditya II and the references to the two wives of Vikramakēsari in some epigraphs of Āditya II[5] are thus seen in harmony with the conclusion expressed above.[6]

Further, Prof. Sastri states that "the conquest of Vātāpi by Paradurgamardana has nothing to do with the two Invasions of Vātāpi in the seventh century, in the reigns of the Pallava kings Narasimhavarmaṉ I and Paramēśvaravarmaṉ I,"[7] that Samarābhirāma's triumph over a Chāḷukya at

1. Paragraph 88 of *M. E. R.* 1908.
2. 273 of 1903.
3. Paragraph 90 of *M. E. R.* 1908.
4. *J. O. R.* Vol. VII. (1933) pp. 1–8.
5. 287 of 1911; 273 of 1903; *E. I.* Vol. XX. p. 54.
6. *J. O. R.* Vol. VII. p. 4.
7. *Ibid.* p. 7.

the battle of Adhirājamaṅgalam is connected with the Rāshṭrakūta invasion of the Chōḷa country in the first half of the tenth century and that Bhūti Vikramakēsari's wars against the Pallavas and Vañjivēḷs were of the nature of local conflicts in which he got the better of other local feudatories less enterprising than himself.[1] It is significant that Prof. Sastri's date for Bhūti Vikramakēsari is in consonance with the fact that the architectural style of the Mūvarkōvil at Koḍumbāḷūr belongs to the tenth century A. D. In brief, Prof. Sastri's view on the date of the Koḍumbāḷūr inscription of Bhūti Vikramakēsari is least objectionable and most probable. For our purpose, therefore, the record cannot be used with any certainty.

One of the Śendalai pillar inscriptions states that Perumbidugu Muttaraiyaṉ II alias Śuvaraṉ Māraṉ, an elder contemporary of Nandivarmaṉ II (*c.* A.D. 710–*c.*775) destroyed Koḍumbāḷūr.[2] It was probably in the course of his wars against the Pāṇḍyās that Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ overpowered the Vēḷir chiefs of Koḍumbāḷūr. It seems that the latter's support to the Pāṇḍyas was the cause of the conflict mentioned above.

It is interesting to note that some Pallava inscriptions of the ninth century mention a few Vēḷir chiefs. An inscription from Tiruveḷḷaṟai (Lalgudi Taluk, Trichinopoly district) dated in the sixth year of Nandivarmaṉ III mentions a certain Mārppiḍugu Iḷaḷaṅgōvēḷar Śāttaṉ.[3] It is not clear whether Mārppiḍugu Iḷaṅgōvēḷār was a Vēḷir chief of Koḍumbaḷūr or, as Dr. Arokiaswami thinks, a Vēḷir officer under the

1. *Ibid.*
2. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. p. 142.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 48; 88 of 1910.

Muttaraiyars.[1] The record, however, indicates the Muttaraiya-Vēḷir connections during the period under consideration. Another inscription from Kiḷūr (Tirukkoyilūr taluk, S. Arcot district) dated in the eleventh year of Nandivarmaṉ III seems to record a gift of gold for a lamp to the God of Tirukkōvilūr in Malāṭṭukkuṟukkai Kūṟṟam by a lady, who was the wife of Śāttaṉ Maṟavaṉ and a daughter of Viḍēlviḍugu Iḷaṅgō-Adhiyaraiyaṉ alias Vikrama Bhūti.[2] Another fragmentary inscription from the same place dated in the sixteenth or eleventh year of the same Pallava king records a gift of gold by Teṉṉavaṉ .... Māṟaṉ Bhūti.[3] It is practically certain that this chief is identical with Vikrama Bhūti of the preceding record. Vikrama Bhūti was very probably a Vēḷir chief of Koḍumbāḷūr. His title, Viḍēlviḍugu, indicates his subordination to the Pallavas. Another fragmentary inscription from Tiruvoṟṟiyūr (Saidapet taluk, Chingleput district) dated in the regnal year of Pallava Kō-Vijaya Kampavarmaṉ records an agreement made by the assembly of Vaikāṭṭūr to provide offerings to the God Mahādēva at Tiruvoṟṟiyūr, on the day of Śaṅkarānti, for the interest on 27 kaḷañju of gold received by them from Pūdi-Arindigai, wife of Viḍēlviḍugu (Īḷaṅgōvē)ḷār of Koḍumbāḷūr.[4] Very little is known of the role of these Vēḷir chiefs in the Pallava-Pāṇḍya wars of the period under review.

It is suggested that Vikkiyaṇṇaṉ, who assisted the Chōḷa king Āditya I in his military campaigns, was probably a

---

1. *The Early History of the Veḷḷār Basin.* p. 95.
2. *S. I. I.* Vol. VII. No. 924; 295 of 102. The inscription is damaged at several places.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. VII. No. 925; 296 of 1902.
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 103; 174 of 1912.

chief of Koḍumbāḷūr.[1] But this is doubtful.[2] It is, however, probable that before Āditya I's conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam, the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs became the subordinate allies of the Chōḷas of Tanjore. It is not known whether Mallaṉ Viḍumaṉ alias Teṉṉavaṉ Tamiḷ-Adhiyaraiyaṉ, who renovated the Śiva temple at Nārttāmalai[3] was a Vēḷir chief of Koḍumbāḷūr or a subordinate of the Muttaraiyars. If the former suggestion is correct, it would mean that in the time of Mallaṉ Viḍumaṉ (*c.* A.D. 850– *c.* 875) the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs became feudatory to the Chōḷa king Vijayālaya because the temple was named after Vijayālaya after renovation. It will be clear, from thc foregoing pages, that the evidences at our disposal are not sufficient for any detailed investigation regarding the nature and consequences of Pallava-Vēḷir connections.

---

1. Paragraph 11 of *M. E. R.* 1912.
2. See K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. *Op. cit.*, p. 115.
3. 216 of 1940–41.

IV

THE CHŌḶAS OF UṞAIYŪR AND PAḶAIYĀṞAI

(c. A. D. 575 - c. 895):

The history of the Chōḷas after the Saṅgam period till the capture of Tanjore by Vijayālaya in the 9th century is obscure. The Kaḷabhra occupation of the Chōḷa country resulted in the decline and dispersal of the Chōḷas as evidenced by the existence of several Chōḷa princes in many places not only in the Kāvērī region but also in the Telugu country. As regards the Chōḷas of the Tamil country we find them in the 7th century ruling from Uṟaiyūr and Paḷaiyāṟai.[1] It is not possible in the present state of our knowledge to make any separate study except in one or two cases of the role either of the Chōḷas of Uṟaiyūr or of the Chōḷas of Paḷaiyāṟai in the affairs of the Pallava empire. As far as our period of investigation is concerned it begins with Pallava conquest of the Chōḷa country.

According to the Kaśākkuḍi plates of Nandivarmaṉ II[2] Simhavishṇu conquered a Chōḷa king along with the Kaḷabhra and Mālava rulers. The existence of a village called Simhavishṇuchaturvēdimaṅgalam, referred to in an inscription of

1. Mr. V. Venkayya's view that Uṟaiyūr continued to be the capital of the Chōḷaṣ during all this period (*A. S. I.* 1905–6, p. 178) is supported by literary and epigraphical evidences. As regards Paḷayāṟai Prof. T. P. Minakshisundaram and Sri T.V. Sadasiva Pandarathar have brought out its importance as a Chōḷa capital. See the article on Paḷayāṟai in *J. A. U.* Vol. XVI. pp, 26–36

4. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. V. P. 356.

Uttama Chōḷa[1] confirms the Kaśākkuḍi plates in respect of Simhavishṇu's conquest of the Chōḷa country. Though it is not clear whether the Pallavas conquered the whole or part of the Chōḷa country[2] it is practically certain that the Chōḷas were reduced to a subordinate position.[3]

The Tamil work *Periyapurāṇam* mentions a Chōḷa king of Paḻaiyāṟai in connection with St. Appar's pilgrimage to that place.[4] But his relations with the Pallavas are not clear. It is known from the hymns of St. Sambandar that Nedu-māṟan, identifiable with Arikēsari Māṟavarmaṉ (*c.* A. D. 640-670), had a Chōḷa princess by name Maṅgaiyarkkaraśi for his queen.[5] This matrimonial alliance between the Chōḷas and the Pāṇḍyas seems to have been preceded by a conflict as the Vēḷvikkuḍi grant indicates.[6] The Pāṇḍya-Chōḷa alliance, noted, above, appears to have had no adverse effect on Pallava sway over the Chōḷa country.

In regard to the role of the Chōḷas in the earlier conflicts between the Pallavas and the W. Chāḷukyas a few scraps of debatable information are available. The Aihoḷe inscription of Pulikēśin II[7] states that he crossed the Kāvērī, made

---

1. No. 265 of 1907.
2. Mr. K. R. Venkatarama Aiyar thinks that the Chōḷa country south of Trichinopoly was never under Pallava rule. *J. I. H.* Vol. XXXIII. p. 347.
3. *Contra* V. Venkayya. *A. S. I.* 1905-6. p. 176.
4. Vide. *Tirunāvukkasar purāṇam.*
5. St. Sambandar's Tiruvālavāy padigam Nos. 1 & 9.
6. See T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar – *Pāṇḍyar Varalāṟu.* Appe. No. 1, p. 200. The translation given in *E. I.* Vol. XVII. pp. 291–309 makes no mention of it.
7. *E. I.* Vol VI. p. 10.

alliance with the Chōḷas, the Kēraḷas and the Pāṇḍyas and defeated the Pallavas. The Kūram plates of Paramēśvaravarmaṉ I state that Narasimhavarmaṉ I "repeatedly" conquered the Chōḷas along with other kings.[1] This information coupled with the fact that the Chōḷas had matrimonial connections with the Pāṇḍyas may lead one to doubt whether in the first half of the 7th century the Chōḷas had any alliance with the W. Chāḷukyas against the Pallavas. The veracity of Pulikēśin II's claim regarding his alliance with the Chōḷas and other powers can be considered only when authentic information about the route of his invasion of the Pallava empire is available. Moreover, the hold of the Pallavas on the Chōḷa country during this period appears to have remained undisturbed.[2] Possibly the Aihoḷe inscription refers to the non-alignment of the three southern powers in the Pallava-Chāḷukya struggle of this period.

According to some W.Chāḷukya records[3] Vikramāditya I, (*c.*A.D. 655–680) the son and successor of Pulikēśin II invaded the Pallava empire, captured Kāñchī, marched southwards and encamped at Uragapura i. e., Uṟaiyūr.[4] But soon he was put to rout by Paramēśvaravarmaṉ I at Peruvaḷanallūr (Lalgudi

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. I. p. 152.
2. See paragraph 2 of *M. E. R.* 1930–31.
3. The Nerur plates of Vijayāditya (I. A. Vol. IX. p. 129); The Sorab grant of Vinayāditya (*I.A.* Vol. XIX. p. 151); The Kendur plates of Kīrtivarmaṉ II (*E. I.* Vol. IX. pp. 205–06); The Gadval plates of Vikramāditya I (*E. I.* Vol X. pp. 100–06); and the Savnur plates (*E. I.* Vol. XXVII. pp. 115–116).
4. Dr. Hultzsch's identification of Uragapura with Negapatam in the Tanjore district (*E. I.* Vol. X. p. 102) is untenable. See K. A. Nilakanda Sastri *Op. cit.* p. 108.

taluk, Trichinopoly district).[1] Since the W. Chāḷukya records cited above, describe the Chōḷas as the 'enemies' of Vikramāditya, it is not unlikely that the former assisted the Pallava king in vanquishing the W. Chāḷukya army.

Though the Pāṇḍya king Kōchchaḍaiyaṉ alias Raṇadhīraṉ, son of Arikēsari Māṟavarmaṉ is called Śembiyaṉ[2] and is thought to have maintained supremacy over his Chōḷa contemporary[3] the exact nature of his relations with the Chōḷas is not clear. It is known from the Vēḷvikkuḍi grant[4] that Nandivarmaṉ II sustained several defeats at the hands of the Pāṇḍya king Rājasiṁha I, son of Kōchchaḍaiyaṉ, and, according to the Udayēndiram plates[5] was besieged at Nandipura by the Dramiḷa (i. e. Tamil) princes. That the Pāṇḍya and Chēra kings assisted by the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs laid the siege of Nandipura is practically certain,[6] though it is not specifically mentioned in the Udayēndiram plates. The role of the Chōḷas in the siege is not clear. The Vēḷvikkuḍi grant mentions Rājasiṁha's renovation of the palaces and ramparts of Kūḍal, Vañji and Kōḻi i. e. Uṟaiyūr.[7] If the statement is taken at its face value it would mean that a Chōḷa prince of Uṟaiyūr was subordinate to the Pāṇḍya king. The conquest of Maḻa-koṅgu by Rājasiṁha I renders this view possible. The possibility is strengthened by the fact that this Pāṇḍya

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. p. 371.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XVII. p. 307
3. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom.* p. 55
4. *E. I.* Vol. XVII. p. 307.
5. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. III., p. 372.
6. See *E. I.* Vol. XIII. Śendalai Inscriptions. pp. 134–149.
7. *E.* I. Vol. XVII. p. 307.

king had matrimonial connections with the Chōḷas.[1] If the possibility turns out to be a fact, it may be said, that the Chōḷas assisted the Pāṇḍyas in the siege of Nandipura. But the Śendalai inscriptions of Śuvaraṉ Māṟaṉ alias Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II,[2] an elder contemporary of Nandivarmaṉ II make no mention of the Chōḷas among the enemies conquered by him. Possibly on the arrival of Udayachandra at Nandipura the Chōḷas joined him deserting the Pāṇḍyas.

We have already stated that a branch of the Chōḷa dynasty was, during this period, ruling from Paḻaiyāṟai. There is clear evidence that Nandipura was then a part of Paḻaiyāṟai.[3] Since a part of Paḻaiyāṟai was called after Nandivarmaṉ, it may be presumed that the Chōḷas of Paḻaiyāṟai were feudatory to him before the siege. But whether they continued to be feudatory to the Pallava king or not, is not known. In other words, the role of the Chōḷas in the siege of Nandipura is not clear, though their participation in it is quite probable. The subsequent re-establishment of Pallava supremacy in the Chōḷa country is borne out by the existence there of some of the records of Nandivarmaṉ II[4]

Some years after the siege of Nandipura the Pallava power experienced another set-back. The Vēḷvikkuḍi grant of Neḍuñjaḍaiyaṉ, son of Rājasimha I, describes him as king of the Chōḷas and mentions his success over the Pallavas at Peṇṇāgaḍam about A. D. 768.[5] The absence of any reference

1. According to Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar, the sister of Rājasimha I was given in marriage to a Chōḷa prince. (*Pāṇḍyar Varalāṟu*. p. 46.)
2. *E. I.* Vol. XIII. pp. 134–149.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. XIII. No. 259.
4. Nos. 33 and 36 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XII.
5. *E. I.* Vol. XVII. pp. 307–8.

in the record to Pāṇḍya-Chōḷa conflict in this war seems to suggest that the Chōḷas might have thrown in their lot with the Pāṇḍyas on the eve of or sometime before the war.

The Madras Museum plates of the same Pāṇḍya king dated in his 17th year (*c.* A. D. 782) mention his another remarkable victory over the combined forces of the Kēraḷa, Pallava and Adigamāṉ rulers at several places on the northern bank of the Kāvērī.[1] But the record is silent on the Chōḷas This seems to indicate that the Chōḷas continued to be the vassals of the Pāṇḍyas and supported the latter in their wars with other powers.

The continuance of Pāṇḍya sway over the Kāvērī region during and after the reign of Neḍuñjaḍaiyaṉ is attested by the absence from that region of Dantivarmaṉ's inscriptions dated after his 16th year and by the existence of several Pāṇḍya inscriptions there.[2] There appears to be no room for doubt that during this period the Chōḷas paid their allegiance to the Pāṇḍyas.

The accession of Nandivarmaṉ III ushered in another period of Pallava-Pāṇḍya struggle. The Kuṉṉāṇḍārkōvil inscription dated in the third year of Nandivarmaṉ III[3] perhaps indicates the transitory reassertion of Pallava supremacy in the distant south even before the battle of Teḷḷāṟu. It seems that before this battle the Pāṇḍyas carried their arms as far as Araśūr on the northern bank of the Peṇṇai in southern Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam.[4] But Nandivarmaṉ III's triumph at Teḷḷāṟu about A. D. 836 checked their progress

---

1. *I. A.* Vol. XXII. p. 73.
2. e. g. 160 and 37 of 1931.
3. See *S. I.* I. Vol. XII. No. 46.
4. *E.* I. Vol. IX. No. 10, p. 91.

and was soon followed by his reconquest of the Chōḷa country as evidenced by the existence of some of his records in the Chōḷa country.[1] The Tamil work *Nandikkalambakam* mentions Nandivarmaṉ III's victories at Paḷaīyāṟai, Kaḍambūr, Veṟiyalūr Kurukkōṭṭai etc.[2] It is very probable that the Pallava king's fight at these places was connected with the battle of Teḷḷāṟu.

Now let us see whether it is possible to say anything about the part played by the Chōḷas in the battle of Teḷḷāṟu. The Vēlūrpāḷayam plates of Nandivarmaṉ III dated in his 6th year mention a Chōḷa king by name Kumarāṇkuśa and the gift of a village made at his request.[3] Apparently Kumarāṅkuśa was a feudatory of the Pallava king. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri regards this Chōḷa king as belonging to a separate line of Chōḷas who "form the link connecting the early Cōḷas of the Tamil country and the numerous dynasties of petty chieftains in the Telugu and Karnataka country."[4] Nevertheless we may regard the Chōḷa king as a Tamil ruler for the inscription comes from a Tamil district and is written in Sanskrit and Tamil. Though his prowess is praised in the record, his martial exploits are not stated. Perhaps he might have fought against the Pāṇḍyas on some earlier occasion. It is not known if he took part in the battle of Teḷḷāṟu which is mentioned in most of the records of Nandivarmaṉ issued from his tenth year.

The Tamil work *Nandikkalambakam* describes how Nandivarmaṉ III captured Paḷaiyāṟai destroying the hostile

---

1. e. g., *S. I. I.* Vol. III. No. 56.
2. vv. 19–31.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. II: No. 98.
4. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *The Cōḷas*, p. 104.

armies.[1] As has been already noted Paḷaiyāṟai was one of the centres of the Chōḷa power during the period under review. Since Nandivarmaṉ III is said to have taken Paḷaiyāṟai after a fight, it seems probable that the Chōḷas of this place had stood by the Pāṇḍyas in their war with the Pallava king. The capture of Paḷaiyāṟai was doubtless followed by the Chōḷa acknowledgement of Pallava overlordship for the *Nandikkalambakam* describes Nanivarmaṉ III as the lord of the Chōḷa country, lord of Uṟaiyūr etc.[2]

It may be noted in passing that some time after the famous battle of Teḷḷāṟu the Chōḷas under Vijayālaya took Tanjore from the Muttaraiyars who were probably at that time in alliance with the Pāṇḍyas. The event contributed much to the rise of the Chōḷa power and was responsible for the waning of the Muttaraiya power in the Kāvērī region.

The battle of Teḷḷāṟu did not put an end to the Pallava-Pāṇḍya struggle for supremacy over the Chōḷa country. Some years after that war, Śrīmāṟa Śrīvallabha, the father of Varaguṇa II, invaded the Chōḷa country, and according to the Śiṉṉamaṉūr plates, defeated the Chōḷas along with the Pallavas, Gaṅgas, Kaliṅgas and Magadhas.[3] It is not known whether after this war the Chōḷas paid allegiance to the Pāṇḍyas or to the Pallavas. Whatever it may be, the Śiṉṉamaṉūr plates contain the first clear testimony for the Pallava-Chōḷa alliance.

The accession of Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṉ, the son and successor of Nandivarmaṉ III, was followed by his war with

---

1. "கூடார், படையாறுசாயப் பழையாறு வென்றான்" v. 31.
2. *Ibid.* vv. 5 and 44.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. III. p. 461.

the Pāṇḍyas. In the battle of Arichit Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṉ is said to have "burnt a confederation of enemies in a battle on the bank of the Arichit."[1] Though the role of the Chōḷas in this war is not clear from the evidence at our disposal, it is possible that they assisted the Pallava king.

There seems to have been no active hostilities between the Pāṇḍyas and the Pallavas for about two decades after this war. During this period the Chōḷas were steadily strengthening themselves. The persistent efforts of the Pāṇḍyas to bring the Kāvērī region under their control resulted in the great battle of Śrīpuṟambiyam about A. D. 880. In that final contest between the Pallavas and the Pāṇḍyas the Chōḷas rendered remarkable assistance to their Pallava overlord, Aparājita.[2] It has been aptly remarked that in this battle the Pallavas owed their success more to the might of their feudatories than to their own.[3] The results of the war were far-reaching. The great benefits of the victory were reaped not by the Pallavas but by the Chōḷas whose services in the war earned for them territories far beyond their traditional frontiers.[4] The disappearance of the danger of Pāṇḍya imperialism which had for some time past been responsible

---

1. *E. I.* Vol. XVIII. p. 13.
2. *Contra.* T. A. Gopinatha Rao. *E. I.* Vol. XV. p. 49. Mr. Rao thinks that Āditya allied with the Pāṇḍya king Varaguṇa II and defeated and killed Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṉ in the fight at Śrīpuṟambiyam. Further, he identifies Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṉ with Aparājita. Obviously the identification is beseless and the alliance is highly improbable. See K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. *Op. cit.* p. 118, F. n. 16.
3. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. *Op. cit.*, p. 110.
4. *Ibid.* p. 118. F. n. 26.

for the effective alliance between the declining Pallavas and the rising Chōḷas now made room for a conflict between them.

Some years after the victory at Śrīpuṟambiyam the relations between the Chōḷas and the Pallavas seem to have become strained in spite of the fact that Āditya I had a Pallava princess for his queen.[1] It seems that at the same time the Muttaraiyars and the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs were steadily coming under Chōḷa control. The immediate cause of Āditya I's attack on the Pallava empire is not known. Yet there is no doubt that it put an end to the Pallava power. The Tiruvālaṅgāḍu plates[2] and the Kaṉyākumari inscription[3] describe how Āditya conquered Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam killing Aparājita in a great fight. Many similar cases of overmighty feudatories superseding their paramount powers are found in Indian history. The early Kadambas were overthrown by their vassals, the W. Chāḷukyas, the latter by their feudatories, the Rāshṭrakūṭas and the Rāshṭrakūtas by their Chāḷukya feudatories.

In conclusion it may be said that on some occasions the Chōḷas of the Tamil country assisted the Pallavas in their campaigns against the W. Chāḷukyas and Pāṇḍyas and on some other occasions made common cause with the Pāṇḍyas against the Pallavas. Though the Pallava power was brought to a close by the Chōḷas, they were not wholly responsible for it for frequent wars on distant fronts greatly exhausted the resources of the Pallava empire. That apart, the Pallavas lost the support of almost all their feudatories even before Āditya I's invasion of the Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. The Bāṇas

1. Paragraph 2 of *M. E. R.* 1927–28.
2. *S. I. I.* Vol. III. No. 205. v. 49.
3. *T. A. S.* Vol. III. No. 34. v. 55.

became independent of the Pallava power about A.D. 888. The Muttaraiyars, the W. Gaṅgas and the Kōḍumbāḷūr chiefs seem to have come under Chōḷā influence. The limited area within which Aparājita's inscriptions are found indicates the speedy decline of the Pallava power.[1] There can be, therefore, no wonder that Āditya I compassed the ruin of the Pallava power at one blow.

Religion:

The Pallava period witnessed great religious movements in the Tamil country in general and in the Chōḷa country in particular. All the important religions of the day had their zealous votaries there. Though the Chōḷas followed Śaivism and Vaishṇavism, they tolerated the protestant faiths viz., Jainism and Buddhism.

Śaivism :

It is significant that a great majority of the sixty three Nāyaṉārs (i. e., Śaiva saints) belonged to the Chōḷa country.[2] It is beyond the scope of the work to give any detailed account of them. Nevertheless, something may be said about some of them. St. Sambandar, the first and foremost of the Dēvāram trio, was a native of Śīrkāḻi (Tanjore district). He espoused the cause of Śaivism throughout the Tamil country and was, to a considerable extent, responsible for the fall of Jainism and Buddhism from their proud position in the Tamil country. His majestic hymns and extensive pilgrimages greatly helped the growth of Śaivism. Śiṟuttoṇḍar another celebrated Śaiva saint, came from Tiruchcheṅgāṭṭāṅkuḍi

---

1. See K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. *Op. cit.*, p. 118. F. n. 26.
2. Dr. M. Rajamanikkam. *Op. cit.* Appe. No. VI. pp. 352–353.

(Tanjore district) and, according to the *Periyapurāṇam*, led the Pallava expedition to Vātāpi, the W. Chāḷukya capital. Māṉakkañsārar and Kalikkāmar, two other Nāyaṉārs, are described by the same work as Chōḷa generals. It is also known from the *Periyapurāṇam* that when St. Appar visited the Śivā temple at Paḷaiyāṟai, the Jains of the place hid the *Śivaliṅga* and that the Chōḷa king (of Paḷaiyāṟai) intervened in the matter and had the *liṅga* restored to its original place. St. Śundarar is said in the same work to have been received at Madura by a Chōḷa prince along with Pāṇḍya and Chēra kings.[1] The Vēlūrpāḷayam plates of Nandivarmaṉ III dated in his 6th year state that at the request of Kumarāṅkuśa, a Chōḷa prince, the village of Tirukkāṭṭuppaḷḷi was granted to the temple of Yājnēśvāra at the same place.[2] The Chōḷa king Vijayālaya is known to have erected a temple in Tanjore for goddess Durgā.[3] An inscription of Āditya I from Tiruppaḷaṉam (Tanjore district) dated in his 23rd year states that his queen who was of Pallava descent made a gift for a lamp to the god of Tiruppaḷaṉam.[4] A similar gift was made by

---

1. "சேரமான் தோழருமச் சேரர்பிரானும் பணிப்பூண்,
   ஆரமார்பரை மதுரை ஆலவாயினில் வணங்க,
   வாரமா வந்தணைய வழுதியார் மனக்காதல்,
   கூரமாநகர் கோடித் தெதிர்கொண்டு கொடுபுக்கார்."
   "தென்னவர்கோன் மகளாரைத் திருவேட்டு முன்னரே
   தொன்மதுரை நகரின்கண் இனிதிருந்த சோழனார்,
   அன்னவர்கள் உடன்கூட அணையவ வருங்கூடி,
   மன்னுதிரு ஆலவாய் மணிக்கோயில் வந்தணைந்தார்"
   vv. 91 and 92 of Kaḷaṟiṟṟaṟivār purāṇam.
2. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. V. No. 98.
3. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. *Op. cit.*, p. 116.
4. 161 of 1928.

the same queen to the Śiva temple at Tiruchchātturai (Tanjore taluk).[1]

It is worthy of note that there were many Śaiva *maṭhas* in the Chōḷa country during the Pallava period. The *maṭhas* at Tirumarukal, Tiruvārūr, Tiruvīḻimiḻalai, Vēdāraṇyam, Śīrkāḻi, Tiruppukalūr and Tirukkaḍavūr were, according to the *Periyapurāṇam*, visited by St. Sambandar.

Vaishṇavism:

As regards Vaishṇavism it was professed by some Chōḷa rulers and was in general patronised by all. According to the *Guruparambarāprabāvam*, a late Vaishṇava work, Toṇḍaraḍippoḍi Āḻvār, Tiruppāṇ Āḻvār and Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār hailed from the Chōḷa country. Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār who belonged to a predatory class began his life as a Chōḷa general, turned against his master, became a freebooter and looted the Buddhist Vihāra at Negapatam. His most significant contribution to the *Nālāyiraprabandham* is the *Periya-tirumoḻi.*

Toṇḍaraḍippoḍi Āḻvār, also known as Vipranārāyaṇa lived for a time with Dēvadēvī, a courtesan, got into trouble, but was finally saved by Lord Raṅganātha. *Tirumālai* and *Tiruppaḷḷieḻuchchi* are his contribution to the *Nālāyirapra-bandham.*

Tiruppāṇ Āḻvār came of the lowest caste but his devotion to Lord Raṅganātha was so great that he asked his Brāhmaṇ priest to bring the devotee to his presence. The *Nālāyira-prapandham* contains hymns - only 10 stanzas –, of this Āḻvār.

---

1. No. 351 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XIII.

Toṇḍaraḍippoḍi Āḻvār and Tiruppāṇ Āḻvār were contemporaries of Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār who was a contemporary of Nandivarmaṉ II.[1]

A Chōḻa king of Uṟaiyūr by name Dharmavarmaṉ is described in the *Guruparambarāprabāvam* as the father of the well-known Uṟaiyūr-Nāchchiyār[2] "who declined to marry a mortal, and insisted successfully on her union with Lord Ranganātha."[3] An inscription of Pallava Dantivarmaṉ from Tiruchchāṉūr (Chandragiri taluk, Chittoor district) dated in his 51st year records the gift of gold by the Chōḻa king Ulakapperumāṉār of the Chōḻa country to the Vishṇu temple of that place.[4] It appears that the Chōḻas of this period did not erect any temple 'that could survive the effects of time.'[5]

Jainism:

Attention has already been drawn to the mention in the *Periyapurāṇam* of the existence at Paḻaiyāṟai of Jains. The puranic testimony is confirmed by a poem in *Yāpparuṅgalam*

---

1. See The *Classical Age.* p. 263.
2. The *Guruparambarāprabāvam* – *Tiruppāṇ Āḻvār Vaibavam.*
3. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *Op. cit.* p. 106.
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 43; 262 of 1904.
5. Mr. V. Venkayya observes: "Like the W. Cāḷukyas during the period of Rāṣṭrakūṭa supremacy, the Eastern Cāḷukyas during the period of interregnum between A. D. 972 and 999 and the Pāṇḍyas at the time of Cōḷa supremacy, the Cōḷas at the time of which we are now speaking, probably did nothing worthy of permanent record and were apparently not in a position to erect any monuments that could survive the effects of time." (*A. S. I.* 1905–6), p. 178.

(virutti).[1] Tiruchchirāpaḷḷi, as the suffix of the name seems to suggest, was originally a Jain centre, but probably with Mahēndravarmaṉ's conversion to Śaivism the influence of the Jains of that place began to wane.[2] Other centres of Jainism in the Chōḷa country have been dealt with in the chapter on the Muttaraiyars.

Buddhism:

It is known from the *Periyapurāṇam* that Bōdhimaṅgai[3] was a great seat of Buddhist learning, that St. Sambandar was challenged by the Buddhists of that place, that he vanquished them in a theological disputation and that on their defeat they embraced Śaivism. According to the *Guruparambarā-prabāvam*, there was a Buddhist vihāra at Negapatam in the time of Tirumaṅgai Āḻvār. Inscriptions of the Greater Chōḷas

---

1. "ஏறுயர் கொடியி னிருவிசும்பதிரு மெறிமுகச்
சதிர்கடற்றுணை,
வீறுயர் மணிக்கால் வெண்குடையோங்கு
தண்டுறையின் பழையாற்று,
மாறடு படிவ மதியுறுந் தருண மாதவ னேதமில் பாதம்,
வீறடு கதிக ளாழ்கதி வீழ விளங்கிய
விழுத்துணையாமே."

   S. Bavanandam Pillai's edition (1916) p. 393. Prof. T. P. Meenakshisundaram and Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar take 'ஏறுயர்கொடி' to mean the Pallava flag (*J. A. U.* Vol. XVI. p. 32).

2. *Sentamiḻ*. Vol. 45. (1947–48) pp. 77–82. Also see paragraph 3 of *M. E. R.* 1937–38.

3. "Situated on the Koradachcheri–Mannarkudi road in the Tanjore district;" K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *Op. cit.* p. 108. F. n. 6.

point to such a possibility.[1] Paḻaiyāṟai is also known to have been a Buddhist centre during the Pallava period.[2]

The data given above go to prove that the rapid progress of Śaivism and Vaishṇavism during the Pallava period did not result in the complete extinction in the Chōḻa country of Jainism and Buddhism. But their great influence in the Chōḻa country was gone for ever. The religious policy of the Chōḻas of this period was, to some extent, responsible for such a change.

—

1. *Ibid.* pp. 656–7.
2. "முழங்கு களியானை மூரிக் கடற்படை முறிதார் மன்னன்,
   வழங்குமிடமெல்லாம் தன்புகழே போக்கிய வைவேல் விண்ணன்,
   செழுந்தண் பழசையுட் சிறந்து நாளுஞ்செய,
   எழுந்தசேதி கத்துளிருந்த அண்ணலடி,
   விழுந்தண்பூ மலர்களால் வியந்துநா ளுந்தொழத்,
   தொடர்ந்து நின்றவ்வினை துறந்துபோ மாலரோ."

   Yāpparuṅgalam(virutti)–quoted in *J.A.U.* Vol. XVI. p. 32. Prof. T. P. Minakshisundaram and Mr. T.V. Sadasiva Pandarathar think that 'பழசை' is a contraction of Paḻaiyāṟai and that 'விண்ணன்' was probably a Chōḻa feudatory of the Pallavas. (*Ibid*).

V

THE CHŌḶAS OF RĒNĀṆḌU (*c*. A. D. 545 - *c*. 630)

The history of the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu during the period under review is not so obscure as that of the Chōḷas of the Tamil country. Besides a large number of stone records we have some copper-plate records of these Chōḷas. There is, however, much uncertainty about their chronology and, to some extent, genealogy.

As regards Rēnāṇḍu Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri states that it "comprised the tract of land lying along the Kundēru river in the Cuddapah and Karnūl districts,"[1] though a slightly different view is expressed by the same historian and Mr. M Venkataramayya in *E. I.* Vol. XXVII (1947) p. 225. Dr. N. Venkataramanayya thinks that Rēnāṇḍu comprised the whole of the Cuddapah district.[2] Mr. V. Venkayya holds that the south-west of the Anantapur district was part of the Rēnāṇḍu country.[3] Since most of the records of the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu come from the Jammalamadugu, Proddatur, Kamalapuram, Pulivendla and Razampeta taluks of the Cuddapah district, it is certain that a major portion of the district was in the Rēnāṇḍu country. Hiuen Tsang's description of Chu-li-ya i. e., the kingdom of the Chōḷas, makes it clear that the forest region of the Kurnool district was a part of Rēnāṇḍu.[4] The identification of Chirpali, the capital of

1. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *Op. cit.*, p. 103.
2. *M. C. C. Mag.* Jan. 1929. p. 13.
3. *A. S. I.* 1905-06. p. 175.
4. *M. E. R.* 1906, paragraph 6.

Puṇyakumāra, with Chippili in the Madanapalle taluk of the Chittoor district[1] makes it probable that portions of this district also formed part of Rēnāṇḍu. It is quite doubtful whether Rēnāṇḍu included any part of the Kolar or Anantapur district.

A word also about the origin of these Chōḷas will not be out of place here. Mr. V. Venkayya thinks that portions of the Kurnool and Cuddapah districts formed part of the dominions of Karikāla, that either the expansion of the W. Chāḷukyas under Pulikēśin II or the aggression of the Pallavas on an earlier occasion must have broken up the power of the Chōḷas and that in consequence of it, the Chōḷa power in the Telugu country was confined to a small territory known as Rēnāṇḍu.[2] On the other hand Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri rejects this view and states that "the Pallava dominion of the Simhavishṇu line may have been the medium through which the drift of the Cōḷas to the north took place."[3] Another suggestion made by the same historian and Mr. M. Venkataramayya on an earlier occasion is that the migration of the Chōḷas to the Telugu country was "part of a general northward movement caused by the conditions following upon the disturbances due to the Gupta raid into Eastern Deccan."[4] All these views are apparently based on uncertain presumptions. As far as available evidence is concerned there is no indication that the Chōḷas established their rule in the Telugu country before the 5th century A. D. What appears to be probable is that the establishment of Kaḷabhra rule at Kāverippūmpaṭṭiṇam referred to in the

---

1. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 225.
2. *A. S. I.* 1905-6, p. 175, F. n. 8.
3. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *Op. cit.*, p. 107, F. n. 1.
4. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 247.

Vinayavinicchaya of Buddhadatta (5th century A. D.) caused the migration to the Telugu country of a branch of the Chōḷa dynasty.[1] Deprived of their traditional territory the Chōḷas sought their fortune in the far off northern region and eventually acknowledged the supremacy of the Pallavas.

Nandivarman̤ (*c.* A. D. 540– *c.* 565.)

Nandivarman̤, the great-grandfather of Puṇyakumāra, mentioned in the Mālēpāḍu[2] and Dommara-Nandyāla plates[3] is the first known Chōḷa king of Rēnāṇḍu. Since he is named after the Pallava king, Nandivarman̤ I, it may be surmised that he was a feudatory of that Pallava king who may be assigned to the first half of the 6th century A. D.[4] There seems to be no difficulty in presuming that the father of this Chōḷa king was a subordinate of the Pallavas and hence named his son after a Pallava king.[5] Little is known of the

---

1. See *Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar Commemoration Volume*. p. 243.
2. *E I.* Vol. XI. p. 339.
3. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 274.
4. See *Ibid.*, p. 250–51.
5. Writing on the Mālēpāḍu plates Mr. H. Krishna Sastri expresses "the possibility of some undefined relationship, political or otherwise, that may have existed between the Chōḷas of the Cuddapah district and the Pallavas of Kāñchī" (E. I. Vol. XI. p. 341). The relationship is not too obscure to define. The ancient practice of feudatories assuming the names and titles of their overlords makes it easy to understand the nature of early Telugu Chōḷa-Pallava connections. The striking similarity in the names and titles of the early Telugu Chōḷas and the Pallavas clearly indicates the subordination of the former to the latter. There seems to have been no matrimonial alliance between the two dynasties.

services of this Chōḷa king to the Pallavas. Mr. K. V. Subramanya Aiyar suggests that either this Chōḷa king or his son, Śundarananda may be identified with Nandachōḷa whose benefactions to the Vishṇu temple at Śrīraṅgam are noted in the Tamil Vaishṇava work, *Kōyiloḻuhu.*[1] This suggestion is very doubtful.

Simhavishṇu (*c.* A. D. 565 - *c.* 575)

Nandivarmaṉ had three sons[2] and was succeeded by the eldest of them, Simhavishṇu, obviously named after the Pallava king Simhavishṇu (*c.* A. D. 575- *c.* 600). Nothing is known about the political activities of this Chōḷa king.

Dhaṉañjayavarmaṉ (*c.* A. D. 585- *c.* 595)

The order of succession after the Chōḷa king Simhavishṇu is not clear though it is possible that he was followed by his two brothers in succession.[3] Dhaṉañjayavarmaṉ, the youngest brother of Simhavishṇu, figures in an inscription from Kalamaḷḷa (Kamalapuram taluk, Cuddapah district).[4] Another inscription from Eṟṟaguḍipāḍu (the same taluk) is also assigned to this king.[5] The latter record mentions Erikal Muṭturāju and Vallava Dukarājulu. Erikal Mutturāju is regarded as identical with Dhaṉañjayavarmaṉ and

1. *His. Sk. An. Dek.* p. 207.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 339 and *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 274.
3. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 224.
4. *Ibid.* pp. 221-22.
5. *Ibid.* pp. 225-226.

Vallava Dukarājulu is taken to be a Pallava prince of Kāñchī, probably Simhavishṇu.[1]

Mahēndravarmaṇ (*c.* A. D. 595– *c.* 620).

Dhaṇañjayavarmaṇ was followed by his son Mahēndravarmaṇ I. The Mālēpāḍu plates of Puṇyakumāra state that Mahēndravarmaṇ acquired the title 'Chōḷa Mahārāja' and was the lord of Pāṇḍya, Chōḷa and Kēraḷa countries.[2] Two inscriptions from Kamalapuram taluk are assigned to this king.[3] It is held by Dr. N. Venkatramanayya that Mahēndravarmaṇ's assumption of the title Chōḷa Mahārāja indicates his assertion of independence.[4] But the title Mahārāja was generally assumed by powerful feudatories besides independent kings. For instance, Kumarāṅkusa, a Chōḷa vassal of Nandivarmaṇ III, is called Chōḷa Mahārāja in the Vēlūrpāḷayam plates.[5] Therefore Mahēndravarmaṇ's title, Chōḷa Mahārāja, need not necessarily indicate his independent status. On the other hand his name and his contemporaneity with Pallava Mahēndravarmaṇ I make it certain that he was a feudatory of the Pallava king.[6] As this Chōḷa king is called "the lord of Pāṇḍya, Chōḷa and Kēraḷa

---

1. *Ibid.* p. 227. A certain Dhaṇañjyavarmaṇ figures in some Kannaḍa records from the Tumkur district - *E. C.* Vol. XII. Mi. 97 and 100). He should be different from Dhaṇanjayavarmaṇ of Rēnāṇḍu for he is assigned to the 8th century A. D. See *E. C.* Vol. XII. Intro. p. 7.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 339.
3. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. pp. 228–230.
4. *M. C. C. Mag.* Jan. 1929. p. 17.
5. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. V. No. 98, L. 47.
6. See *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 251.

countries"[1] it is inferred that he probably helped the Pallava king Simhavishṇu in his southern campaigns.[2] If this inference is accepted, it may be said that while he was crown-prince, the Chōḷa king assisted the Pallava king against the southern powers.

Gaṇamudita (*c.* A. D. 620– *c.* 625).

The Chōḷa king Mahēndravarmaṉ I had two sons, Guṇamudita and Puṇyakumāra. Guṇamudita, the elder, appears to have ruled only for a short period. The name Guṇamudita is said to have been modelled on Guṇabhara, a title of Pallava Mahēndravarmaṉ I.[3] If this view is accepted, it follows then that Guṇamudita was named after one of the titles of his Pallava contemporary. It may be noted that this view is in harmony with the date given here for Guṇamudita.

Puṇyakumāra (*c.* A. D. 625– *c.* 655)

Guṇamudita was succeeded by his brother Puṇyakumāra. There is difference of opinion among scholars in regard to the date of Puṇyakumāra. Mr. H. Krishna Sastri refers to the Mālēpāḍu plates of this king to the end of the 8th century A. D. on scriptal grounds.[4] Mr. H. K. Narasimhasvami assigns the Dommara-Nandyāla plates issued by the same king in his 10th year i. e., five years after the Mālēpāḍu plates, to the middle of the 8th century A. D.[5] On the other hand

---

1. *E. I*, Vol. XI. p. 339.
2. *E. I.* XXVII. p. 251. *Contra. J. A. H. R. S.* Vol. VII. (1933) p. 224.
3. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 251.
4. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 344.
5. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p, 270.

Dr. N. Venkataramanayya states that the Mālēpāḍu plates belong to the middle of the 7th century.[1] On scriptal grounds the stone inscriptions of Puṇyakumāra are assigned by Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri and Mr. M. Venkataramayya to the first half of the 7th century.[2] Dr. P. Sreenivasachari also holds the same view.[3] Of these views Dr. N. Venkataramanayya's is most probable and is supported by other considerations. It has been accepted even by H. Krishna Sastri that "the adoption by Puṇyakumāra and his ancestors of titles and names which were current among Pallava kings of Simhavishṇu line, makes it probable that they were either the subordinates of the Pallavas or succeeded them politically."[4] It must be noted that in case a feudatory wished to assume the name or title of the supreme dynasty, he assumed for the most part the name or title of his contemporary overlord and not the name or title of his overlord's ancestors. It was in keeping with this practice that the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu assumed the names and titles of their Pallava masters. In short, the names and titles of these Chōḷa rulers furnish a clue for determining their chronology. Thus, some of the titles of Puṇyakumāra which are akin to those of Pallava Mahēndravarmaṉ I,[5] show that he was a contemporary - perhaps a younger contemporary, and a feudatory of the

---

1. *M. C. C. Mag.* Jan. 1929, p. 18.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. pp. 230–232.
3. *J. I. H.* Vol. XV. p. 37.
4. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 344.
5. Puṇyakumāra's titles Mārdavachitta and Madaṉavilāśa "indicate some apparent affinity to Mattavilāśa and Vichitrachitta, the recognised *birudas* of (Pallava) Mahēndravarmaṉ I" - *E. I.* XI. p. 341. See also H. Krishna Sastri's view on the name of the Chōḷa king Mahēndravarmaṉ I - *Ibid.*

Pallava king.[1] All these facts go to prove that Krishna Sastri's date for Puṇyakumāra is untenable.

Though Puṇyakumāra began his career as a subordinate of the Pallavas, he did not continue to be so to the end. In the Rāmēśvaram pillar inscription he bears the title Pṛithivīvallabha and his queen bears the name Vasantipōṟi Chōḷamahādēvī.[2] The title Pṛithivīvallabha was borne by the Chāḷukyas of Vātāpi.[3] As regards Vasantipōṟi it is said that the suffix of her name, pōṟi, indicates her connections with the Chāḷukya dynasty of Vātāpi.[4] In other words the word Pōṟi is held to be peculiar to the royal ladies of Vātāpi.[5] Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri has shown the improbability of Vasantipōṟi belonging to Pōṟi family whose records[6] are found in the Chittoor district.[7] It is therefore probable that Puṇyakumāra had a Chāḷukya princess for his queen. His assumption of the Chāḷukya title Pṛithivīvallabha reinforces the view. The early Telugu Chōḷa - W. Chāḷukya matrimonial

1. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII, p. 251. Dr. N. Venkataramanayya, however, holds that Puṇyakumāra was an independent king and that his assumption of titles similar to those of Pallava Mahēndravarmaṉ I was due to his admiration for the latter (*M. C. C. Mag.* Jan. 1929, p. 17). This is unconvincing.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII, pp. 234–235; 384 of 1904.
3. See *The Classical Age*. pp. 235, 242 and 243.
4. *M. C. C. Mag.* Jan. 1929, p. 18.
5. *Ibid.* The examples given by Dr. N. Venkataramanayya support the view. The names of Vijayamahādēvi Pōṟi, queen of Chandrāditya, son of Pulikēśin II, and Pṛithivīpōṟi, daughter of the Eastern Chāḷukya king Maṅgi Mahārāja are worthy of note.
6. e. g., 307 and 329 of 1922.
7. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII, p. 234.

alliance must have taken place sometime before the 5th year of Puṇyakumāra.[1] The alliance does not appear to have been preceded by any war as the Aihoḷe inscription of Pulikēśin II makes no mention of any conflict between the two powers. Puṇyakumāra's subordinate alliance with the W. Chāḷukyas was not immediately followed by his abandonment of such titles which indicate his connections with the Pallavas.[2]

The Chōḷa king's part in the Pallava - W. Chāḷukya contest of his period is not clear. But it is possible that he fought on the side of the Chāḷukyas in some of the campaigns. Of the three places where Pallava Narasimhavarmaṉ I, triumphed over Pulikēśin II, Maṇimaṅgalam is situated near Kāñchī; Sūramāra may be identified with Sūramāla in the Kalahasti division of the Chittoor district; Pariyaḷa may be identified with Paidēla in the Proddatur taluk of the Cuddapah district.[3] The identification of the last two places suggests that Rēnāṇḍu was also the scene of Pallava - W. Chāḷukya conflict.

The names of certain villages in the Cuddapah district seem to indicate that the Rēnāṇḍu country or part of it was occupied by the Pallavas under Narasimhavarmaṉ I.[4] It is untenable to say that the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu were independent during this period when the Pallavas and the W. Chāḷukyas were engaged in a fierce struggle.[5] An inscription from

1. The Rāmēśvaram pillar inscription is dated in the 5th year Puṇyakumāra.
2. See The Doṃmara-Nandyāla Plates of Puṇyakumāra, *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. p. 276.
3. *J. I. H.* Vol. XV. p. 40.
4. Māmillapaḷḷi and three villages of the name Narasimhapuram in the Badvel taluk and a village of the same name in the Rajampet taluk are worthy of note.
5. *Contra.* *J. A. H. R. S.* Vol. VII, p. 225-26.

Tippalūru (Kamalapuram taluk) dated in the first year of W. Chāḷukya Vikramāditya Satyāśraya records a grant of Pannāsa at Maṟṟalūru to God Veṅgipāra-Īśvara made by Vāmbuḷu while Pōrmukharāma was ruling over Bāṇarājā's territory bounded by the Peṇṇā river.[1] Pōrmukharāma of this record is doubtless identical with Puṇyakumāra who alone in his dynasty had that surname. As regards Vikramāditya we come across two monarchs of the same name in the W. Chāḷukya dynasty one in the 7th century and the other in the 8th century. Both of them had the title Satyāśraya.[2] On scriptal grounds Vikramāditya of the inscription is identified with Vikramāditya II of the 8th century.[3] But, as we have seen, it is not possible to assign Puṇyakumāra to the 8th century. Therefore Vikramāditya of this record must be identified with Vikramāditya I (son and successor of Pulikēśin II) who ruled in the latter half of the 7th century. The record makes it clear that Puṇyakumāra was a subordinate of W. Chāḷukyas and that his reign lasted till at least the first regnal year of W. Chāḷukya Vikramāditya I i. e,- about A. D. 655. Another thing to be noted here is that Puṇyakumāra exercised his sway over Bāṇarāja's territory bounded by the Peṇṇa – i. e., Peṇṇār river. The establishment of Puṇyakumāra's rule over the Bāṇa territory was perhaps the result of Bāṇa subordination to the W. Chāḷukyas. As regards the successors of Puṇyakumāra they were most probably the subordinates of the W. Chāḷukyas.

It is not known whether the descendants of Śundarananda, the second son of the Chōḷa king Nandivarmaṉ, had any contact with the Pallavas of Kāñchī.

---

1. 284 of 1937–38.
2. *The Classical Age.* pp. 242 and 247.
3. Paragraph 15 of *M. E. R.* 1937–38.

It is not unlikely that the subordination of the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu was of considerable assistance to the consolidation and rise of the Pallava power in the time of Simhavishṇu. But their subordinate alliance with the Chāḷukyas of Vātāpi in the first half of the 7th century greatly weakened the Pallavas. The Pallavas lost the powerful support of the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu once for all. Like the latter, the Bāṇas whose territory was adjacent to Rēnāṇḍu threw in their lot with the W. Chāḷukyas. It was only in the reign of Nandivarmaṉ II that we again find the Bāṇas figuring as the allies of the Pallavas. The Pro-W. Chāḷukya policy of the two feudatory dynasties facilitated the frequent incursions of the W. Chāḷukyas into the heart of the Pallava empire.

Jainism :

It is not possible to give any detailed account of the cultural role of the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu in the Pallava empire for the available evidences relating to this aspect are scanty. The account of Hiuen Tsang states that the people of Chu-li-ya (i. e., the Chōḷa country) were believers in the Tīrthikas (i. e., Tīrthaṅkaras), that Digambara Jains were popular and that there were several tens of Deva temples in the country.[1] The existence of Jainism in the Rēnāṇḍu country is also borne out by epigraphical evidence. A Sanskrit inscription found on the hill at Panikēlapāḍu in the Jammalamadugu taluk (Cuddapah district) states that the excellent teacher Vṛishabha who was cloud to the crops namely the righteous (Bhavyas) and who was an unshakable rock to his opponents in discourse, lived on this hill.[2] As

1. Thomas Waters – *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India.* Vol. II, p. 224.

2. 401 of 1940–41.

the term Bhavyas is generally applied to the Jains, Vṛishabha may be taken to be a Jain sage.[1] The conclusion is confirmed by another record. A Kannaḍa inscription from the Chik-Ballapur taluk of the Kolar district describes a certain Vṛishabha as "the most excellent of the Jainas".[2] It is certain that Vṛishabha of the latter record is identical with his namesake mentioned in the former record. The probable date given by L. Rice for Vṛishabha is A. D. 750. But, since the script of the former inscription is considered to be assignable to the 7th century the Jain sage may have lived in that period.[3]

Buddhism ;

The existence of Buddhism in the Rēnāṇḍu country is borne out by the account of Hiuen Tsang. But at the time of the Chinese pilgrim's visit, Buddhism was declining in Rēnāṇḍu. There were several Buddhist monasteries. But all of them "were in ruins, and only some of them had Brethren."[4]

Śaivism and Vaishṇavism :

Though it is certain that Śaivism and Vaishṇavism must have large number of followers in the Rēnāṇḍu country, much information is not available in respect of them. The Rāmēśvaram Pillar inscription of Puṇyakumāra[5] refers to a Śiva temple (the temple of Vasantīśvara) at Tārumuṉṟi which

1. Paragraph 107 of *M. E. R.* 1939–43.
2. *E. C.* Vol. X. Chik-Ball. No. 29.
3. Paragraph 107 of *M. E. R.* 1939–43.
4. Thomas Waters – *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India.* Vol. II, p. 224.
5. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII, p. 234.

was endowed with two gardens by his queen. It is not known whether the temple was built before or after his alliance with the W. Chāḷukyas.

Patronage of Learning :

The Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu were in general noted for learning and patronage of learning. The Chōḷa king Mahēndravarmaṉ I is described in the Mālēpāḍu plates as having been "well versed in grammar and other sciences."[1] Religious learning was much encouraged and a number of inscriptions record gifts of lands and even villages to pious scholars.[2] It is interesting to note that these Chōḷas patronised Telugu and Sanskrit. Most of their earlier records are in Telugu and are very valuable to students of Philology. Some of their copper-plate records like the Mālēpāḍu and Dommara-Nandyāla plates are in Sanskrit prose and verse.

---

1. *E. I.* Vol. XI. p. 339.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XXVII, p. 220–232.

VI

THE ADIGAMĀṆS (*c.* A. D. 550 – *c.* 880)

The history of the Adigamāṉs of Koṅgu is a long but chequered one.[1] The Śaṅgam works *Puṟanāṉūṟu*[2] and *Agaṉāṉūṟu*[3] contain poems composed in praise of Adiyamāṉ Neḍumāṉ Añji, a contemporary of the celebrated poetess Avvaiyār.[4] Tagaḍūr, now known as Dharmapuri (Salem district) was the capital of the Adigamāṉs. It is not clearly known whether the Adigamāṉs ruled over a part or the whole of the Koṅgu country.[5]

The *Periyapurāṇam* of Sēkkiḻār describes at some length a fight between the Chōḻa king Pugaḷ Chōḻa and a certain Adigamāṉ ruler.[6] The Chōḻa king who is described as the

---

1. The word Adigamāṉ appears to have been the dynastic name. It was also known as Adigamāṉ, Adhiyamāṉ and Adigaṉ.
2. Poems 87, 88, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 99, 100, 101, 231, 232 and 235.
3. Poems 162 and 352.
4. It may be noted that Mr. K. G. Sesha Aiyar's identification of Satiyaputa with an Adigamāṉ ruler of Tagaḍūr is supported by T. Burrow (B. S. O. A. S. Vol. XII, pt. I. p. 475).
5. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri holds the former view (*The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom* p. 62) and Mr. T. V. Sadasiva Pandarathar the latter view. (*Pāṇḍyar Varalāṟu.* p. 52).
6. *Pugaḷchōḻa Nāyaṉār Purāṇam.*

overlord of the Adigamāṉ chief is assigned to a period between A. D. 300 and 500.[1] We do not know whether this Adigamāṉ chief had any relations with the Pallavas.

According to some Kannaḍa inscriptions Durvinīta who is assigned to the period *c.* A. D. 540 – *c.* 600[2] triumphed over a certain Kāḍuveṭṭi,[3] and his little son assumed the "Koṅgaṇi crown from the people of Kāḍuveṭṭi."[4] 'Koṅgaṇi crown' is taken to mean the Koṅgu crown i. e., the rule of the Koṅgu country.[5] Kāḍuveṭṭi apparently refers to the Pallava king. If these statements are taken at their face value, they would mean that before the accession of Durvinīta, the Koṅgu country was under Pallava supremacy. But no indication of it is seen in the records of the early Pallavas. Nevertheless, it is very probable that Durvinīta conquered the Koṅgu country. An inscription from Dod-Ballapur taluk[6] mentions his successful campaigns in the Salem and Coimbatore districts.[7] But, before long, the Koṅgu country passed into the hands of the Pallavas.[8]

According to the Kaśākkuḍi plates of Nandivarmaṉ II, Simhavishṇu (*c.* A. D. 575 - *c.* 600), the father of

1. Dr. M. Rajamanikkam *Op. cit.* p. 94.
2. *The Classical Age.* p. 269.
3. *E. C.* Vol. VI. Intro. p. 6.
4. *Ibid.* Çm. 50.
5. M. V. Krishna Rao. *Op. cit.* p. 37.
6. *E. C.* Vol. IX. D. B. No. 68.
7. *Ibid.* p. 3. F.n. No. 1.
8. The Tamil work Koṅgudēśarājākkaḷ which professes to give an account of the rulers of Koṅgu mentions the Raṭṭas among the earlier dynasties that ruled over Koṅgu. But little is known of the relations between the Raṭṭas and the Adigamāṉs.

Mahēndravarmaṉ, conquered a Mālava king.[1] The Mālava king mentioned in the record, is no doubt, the king of the Maḻavas who were well-known for their valour. According to Mr. K. S. Vaidyanathan Maḻanāḍu, the territory of the Maḻavas lay in between the Chōḻa and Koṅgu countries and Maḻa-Koṅgu, a part of Maḻanāḍu included the Kollimalais and its neighbourhood in the Namakkal taluk of the Salem district.[2] That even as early as the Śaṅgam period the Maḻavas were under the Adigamāṉs is clear from the *Puṟanānūṟu.*[3]

The Namakkal inscription[4] which mentions Atiyēndra Vishṇugṛiha besides the titles of Mahēndravarmaṉ I indicates that the Adigamāṉs continued to exercise their control over the Maḻavas in the first half of the 7th century. There can, therefore, be no difficulty in identifying the Mālava king mentioned in the Kaśākkudi plates with an Adigamāṉ ruler.

The Namakkal inscription cited above[5] mentions the titles Nayapara, Prakṛitipriya, Naravā(hana), Utpalakarnika and Udārachitta. Apparently the titles are those of Pallava Mahēdravarmaṉ I and indicate Pallava supremacy over the Maḻavas. As we have no evidence for thinking that Mahēndravarmaṉ conquered a Maḻava king we may very well conclude that the subjugation of Maḻavas under the Adigamāṉs was accomplished by Simhavishṇu.[6]

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. II., pt. 3, p. 356; v. 20.
2. *Q.J.M.S.* Culture and Heritage Number 1956. pp. 225–27.
3. v. 88; Also see Dr. M. Arokiaswamy – *The Koṅgu Country.* P. H.
4. 7 of 1906.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Contra.* Dr. M. Rajamanikkam – *Pallavar Varalāṟu.* p. 83, F.n.

It is not unlikely that Simhavishṇu's conquest of the Maḷavas was followed by his conquest of the Chōḷa country. The order in which the Kaśākkuḍi plates mention Simhavishṇu's achievements seems to render tbis view possible. But the fact that the plates belong to a much later period cannot be overlooked.

Very little is known of the role of the Adigamāṇs in the Pallava-Chāḷukya wars of the seventh and eighth centuries. It is not now possible to say how far the subordination of the Adigamāṇs to the Pallavas in the seventh century was responsible for the absence of any serious trouble to the Pallava empire from the W. Gaṅga side.

The proximity of the Koṅgu country to the Pāṇḍya, Pallava and W. Gaṅga kingdoms gave it a high strategic importance in the eighth century when the three powers were engaged in intermittent wars with one another. The Pāṇḍya incursions into Koṅgu seem to have begun in the reign of Kōchchaḍaiyaṉ Raṇadhīraṉ (*c.* A. D. 670 – *c.* 710) as he is described in the Vēḷvikkuḍi plates as Koṅgarkōmāṉ i. e., lord of the Koṅgas.[1] According to the same record his son Māṟavarmaṉ Rājasimha I (*c.* A. D. 710 – *c.* 765) subdued Maḷakoṅgam, worshipped the God Paśupati at Pāṇḍikkoḍumuḍi and presented heaps of gold and jewels to it.[2] From this it is clear that Pāṇḍya conquests in Koṅgu extended up to Koḍumuḍi (Erode taluk, Coimbatore district). Maḷakoṅgam or Maḷakoṅgu was, as we have noted above, a division of the Koṅgu country.[3] The Vēḷvikkuḍi grant states that Pāṇḍya

1. *E. I.* Vol. XVII, p. 307.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Hist. Sk. An. Dek.* p. 131. Mr. K. V. Subramanya Aiyar states that Maḷakoṅgu was probably the eastern division (of Koṅgu) which extended eastwards from Karur.

Rājasimha contracted relationship with the W. Gaṅgas.[1] This incident did not in any way bar the former's progress in Koṅgu as the Madras Museum plates of Jaṭilavarmaṉ indicates. It seems that hitherto the Adigamāṉs did not come into conflict with the Pāṇḍyas. In case it had happened, it would have been so mentioned in the Vēḷvikkuḍi plates.

The Madras Museum plates of the Pāṇḍya king Jaṭilavarmaṉ alias Neḍuñjadaiyaṉ (*c.* A. D. 765 – *c.* 795) dated in his seventeenth year describe his fight with a certain Adigamāṉ ruler as follows: "Having seen Adiyaṉ (who wore) a resplendent lance, turn to flight at Ayirūr Pugaḷiyūr and Āyiravēli (situated) on the northern bank of the Kāviri (which has) abundant waters (and which is) rich (in) fields, – (he) seized his (the enemy's) chariot (adorned with) sounding bells, along with a troop of horses (which were) fierce in battle; when the Pallava and the Kēraḷa (kings), having become his (the enemy's) allies, swelled and rose like the sea with numerous armies, so that the earth trembled, and when the western and eastern wings (of the army) joined, and were encamped (together), (the king) advanced against (the enemy) with a troop of spearmen and despatched a detachment, so that disaster befell both of them on both wings; captured the powerful king of western Koṅgu, along with (his) murderous elephants; placed (his) banner within the walls of Kūḍal (i. e., Madura) which has spacious halls decorated with precious stones; subdued Koṅgabhūmi so that the noisy drum was sounding his fame throughout Koṅkabhūmi; unfastened the string of the cruel bow; entered the large village of Kāñchivayal (?) (situated) in a woody region (that was) beautified by flower gardens; and built a temple resembling a hill to Tirumāl (i. e., Vishṇu) (in which he) might joyfully

1. *E. I.* Vol. XVII. p. 307.

abide."[1] These events must have taken place sometime before *c*. A. D. 782 when the Madras Museum plates were issued. The three places where the Pāṇḍya king defeated the Adigamāṉ ruler are said to have been situated on the northern bank of the Kāvērī.[2]

The Pallava king who along with the Kēraḷa king helped the Adigamāṉ chief was probably Nandivarmaṉ II or his son Dantivarmaṉ (*c*. A. D. 775 – *c*. 826). It is not improbable that the Pallava king was the overlord of the Adigamāṉ chief mentioned above. There is clear evidence that Nandivarmaṉ II held sway over, at least, part of the Koṅgu country. An undated Grantha inscription found on a rock near the Lakshmīnarasimha cave temple at Namakkal (Salem district) contains the words 'Śrīdhara' and 'Silibhṛitam.'[3] The characters of the record are assignable to the eighth century A. D.[4] Since Śrīdhara is a well-known title of Nandivarmaṉ II,[5] the record must be assigned to that Pallava king.

As regards the identification of the king of Western Koṅgu scholars differ. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri thinks that Adiyaṉ and the Western Koṅgu king of the Madras Museum plates were different rulers, and that the former was subordinate to the latter.[6] But Mr. V. Venkayya,

1. *I. A.* Vol. XXII. p. 73.
2. *Ibid.*
3. 329 of 1938–39.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *S. I. I.* Vol. II, pt, 3, p. 357, v. 29. and *Ibid*, F.n. No. 4.
6. *The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom*. p. 62
7. *I. A.* Vol. XXII. p. 66.

Mr.K.V.Subramanya Aiyar[1] and Mr.T.V.Sadasiva Pandarathar[2] regard the two rulers as identical. The latter view is very probable.

The victory of the Pāṇḍya king was followed by the extension of the Pāṇḍya rule into Koṅgu. It is evident that the Adigamāṉ chief offered desperate resistance to the Pāṇḍya aggression.

We shall now examine the relations between the W. Gaṅgas and the Adigamāṉ chiefs. A Tamil Vaṭṭeḻuttu inscription of Śrīpuruśar from Oḍḍapaṭṭi (Salem district) dated in his seventh year records that a certain Kūṉarundai-Vaḍugaṉ fell, perhaps in connection with a deer hunt.[3] Another Vaṭṭeḻuttu inscription of Śrīpuruśaparumar from the same place dated in his 27th year states that Erumaiya Nakkaṉār, a servant of Teḻiṉiyār, fell while the latter captured Yeruvāyil.[4] Obviously these are Vīrakkal inscriptions. It is suggested that Śrīpuruśar and Śrīpuruśaparumar of the two records may be identified with the W. Gaṅga king Śrīpurusha, that the latter record[5] refers to one of the border fights between the W. Gaṅgas and the Adigamāṉs and that Teḻiṉiyār was a member of the Adigamāṉ line.[6] There is no difficulty in accepting the first and last suggestions.[7] But the second

1. *Hist. Sk. An. Dk.* p. 133.
2. *Pāṇḍyar Varalāṟu.* p. 52.
3. 212 of 1910.
4. 211 of 1910.
5. 211 of 1910.
6. Paragraph 1 and 2 of *M. E. R.* 1911.
7. The name Teḻiṉiyār may favourably be compared with Eḻiṉi or Yavaṉika mentioned in the records of a later Adigamāṉ chief (See *E. I.* Vol. VI. p. 331). It may also be noted that Adigamāṉ Nedumāṉ Añji's son

is certainly wrong. The inscription[1] is dated in the regnal year of Śrīpurusha and records the death of a servant of Teḷiṉiyār. These facts clearly show that Teḷiṉiyār was not an enemy but a subordinate of Śrīpurusha (*c.* A. D. 725–788).

It is not improbable that Srīpurusha's successful invasion of the Pallava empire[2] took place at a time when the Adigamāṉs were feudatory to him. Attention has already been drawn to the existence of a village called Śrīpurusha-maṅgalam in the Wandiwash taluk (N. Arcot district). Two other villages in the same taluk are called Adiyaṉkuppam and Adiyaṉūr evidently after the Adiyamāṉ chiefs. This perhaps indicates that the Adigamāṉs were connected with Śrīpurusha's invasion of the Pallava empire. The existence of an Adigamāṉ inscription[3] at Karaḍikkuḍi in the Vellore taluk of the N. Arcot district seems to lend support to this view.

The Adigamāṉs' subordinate alliance with the W. Gaṅgas seems to have lasted only for short period for we soon find them in alliance with the Pallava and Kēraḷa kings. The Madras Museum plates of Jaṭilavarmaṉ alias Neḍuñjadaiyaṉ

---

was called Poguṭṭeḷiṉi (K. A. Nilakanta Sastri — *History of South India.* p. 118).

1. 211 of 1910.
2. In connection with the Bāṇas we have made a passing reference to a W. Gaṅga invasion of the Pallava empire in the time of Nandivarmaṉ II. That the invasion must have happened during the reign of Śrīpurusha is clear from inscriptional and other evidences. Possibly the invasion synchronized with the capture of Kāñchi by W. Chāḷukya Vikramāditya II.
3. 65 of 1945–46.

refer to this alliance.[1] This change in the attitude of the Adigamāṉs appears to have taken place after Nandivarmaṉ II's triumph over the W. Gaṅgas about A. D. 768[2] and resulted in W. Gaṅga occupation of the Koṅgu country as far as Komāramaṅgalam (Tiruchchengodu taluk, Salem district) in the south.[3] Consequently the Adigamāṉs were driven to the south-western part of the Koṅgu country. All these appear to have taken place sometime before A. D. 771.[4] If we examine the reference in the Madras Museum plates to a W. Koṅgu king in the light of these events it will be easy to identify him with an Adigamāṉ chief. In that case the Pāṇḍya king Neḍuñjadaiyaṉ cannot be said to have conquered the whole of the Koṅgu country.[5]

The subsequent history of the Adigamāṉs is not clear. We find a certain Vijaya Īśvaravarmaṉ issuing records in his own name and regnal year in the Dharmapuri region.[6] An inscription of the same ruler is found at Hebbini (Mulbagal taluk, Kolar district)... [7] Hebbini belonged to what was then called the Gaṅga Six-thousand which was a debatable ground for the W. Gaṅgas and the Bāṇas in the 9th century. The three epigraphs of Vijaya-Īśvaravarmaṉ are written in the Vaṭṭeḻuttu script of Tamil. We do not know whether this Vijaya-Īśvaravarmaṉ and Kō-Vijaya Śkandasishya of the

---

1. *I. A.* Vol. XXII. p. 73.
2. See *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. V. p. 529.
3. See the Salem plates of Śrīpuṛusha *E. I.* Vol. XXVII. pp. 145–8.
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Contra.* K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom.* p. 62.
6. *E. I.* Vol. VII. pp. 23 and 24.
7. *Ibid.* p. 24. Ins. III.

Rāyakōṭṭa plates (Krishnagiri taluk, Salem district) –[1] were of Pallava or W. Gaṅga extraction. One of the Kīḷmuṭṭugūr inscriptions of Kō-Vijaya-Narasimhavarmaṉ (W. Gaṅga chief) dated in his 3rd year refers to a certain (Va)limadura, the chief of Tagaḍūr-nāḍu.[2] The record may be taken to indicate further the dislodgement of the Adigamāṉs from Tagaḍūr-nāḍu and the establishment there of the sway of the W. Gaṅga chief. The circumstances under which these rulers came to exercise their sway over northern Koṅgu are not clear.

By A. D. 878 the Noḷambas under Mahēndra occupied the Dharmapuri region[3] and continued with success their war with the Bāṇas. It seems that during all these times the Adigamāṉs survived in obscurity. At any rate we find them again coming into prominence in the subsequent period of Chōḷa ascendancy.[4]

To conclude W. Gaṅga Śrīpurusha's invasion of the Pallava empire was most probably assisted by the Adigamāṉs who later co-operated with the Pallava and Kēraḷa rulers in combating the growing power of the Pāṇḍyas under Neḍuñ-jadaiyaṉ in the latter half of the eighth century.

CULTURE:

Jainism:

It is interesting to note that in the Koṅgu country, Jainism, Vaishṇavism and Śaivism flourished side by side during the period under consideration. The Jain images

1. *E. I.* Vol. V. pp. 49–55.
2. *E. I.* Vol. IV. No. 52.
3. *E. I.* Vol. X. pp. 54–70; 304 of 1901.
4. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *The Cōḷas.* pp. 326–27.

found at Dharmapuri, Adamaṉkōṭṭai[1] and Bastipuram,[2] and the existence of a Jain monastery noted in an inscription from Dharmapuri[3] show that Jainism had a considerable number of votaries in Koṅgu in general and at Dharmapuri in particular.

Vaishṇavism :

That the Adigamāṉs had some leanings towards Vaishṇavism is clear from the evidence at our disposal. The Raṅganātha temple on the hill at Namakkal was erected by an Adigamāṉ feudatory of the Pallavas. An inscription found in the central shrine of the temple[4] refers to the Atiyēndravishṇugriha and Atiyāṉvavāya. This makes it clear that the temple was originally called Atiyēndra-vishṇugriha evidently after one of the Adiyamāṉs. Tradition embodied in the *Koṅgumaṇḍalaśatakam* confirms the view.[5] As the titles of Pallava Mahēndravarmaṉ I are mentioned in the inscription referred to above, it is certain that the temple must have come into existence during his time.[6]

---

1. Paragraph 4 of *M. E. R.* 1911.
2. Sewell - *List of Anti: Rem.*, p.196.
3. *E.* I. Vol. X. pp. 68-70.
4. 7 of 1906.
5. புதிதாய் மலையைக் குடைந்து நற்சிற்பப்புலவரைக் கொண்,
   டிதிகாசமான கதையைச் செதுக்குவித்திம்பர் மகிழ்ந்,
   ததியேந்த்ர விஷ்ணுக்கிரக மென்றேத்த வமைத்தவனும்,
   மதியூகியான வதிகனும் வாழ்கொங்கு மண்டலமே!

   Poem 80.
6. Another inscription found near the same temple (328 of 1938-39) mentions Manōmaya in Pallava characters of the 7th century. We do not know the Pallava king

It is not unlikely that the Lakshmīnarasimha cave temple at Namakkal was constructed by an Adigamāṉ ruler. The date of the temple is uncertain. Dr. M. Rajamanikkam assigns the temple to the reign of Narasimhavarmaṉ I.[1] The Government Epigraphist thinks that it possibly belongs to the same period as that of the Raṅganātha temple mentioned above.[2] Strangely enough neither of these two Vaishṇava temples is mentioned in the *Nālāyiradivyaprabandham*, the Tamil scriptures of the Vaishṇavas.

An undated Adigamāṉ inscription from Karaḍikkuḍi, (Vellore taluk, N. Arcot district) records an order of a certain Adigamāṉ to the Ūravar (people of the village) of Dharma-kuṟukkai in Āndai-nāḍu, communicating the remission of taxes on the land granted as tiruviḍaiyāttam to the temple of Tiruvēṅgaḍamuḍaiyār in their village.[3]

Śaivism :

As regards Śaivism it may be noted that a Śiva temple was in existence at Koḍumuḍi (Erode taluk, Coimbatore district) even in the first half of the 8th century.[4] The temple is referred to in a hymn of St. Sundarar who sojourned the Koṅgu country.[5] Though the temple of Mallikārjuna at

who bore this *biruda.* It is held that this *biruda* was borne by an Adigamāṉ chief. (Paragraph 2 of *M. E. R.* 1939). This is improbable.

1. *Pallavar Varalāṟu.* p. 123. 1944.
2. Paragraph 36 of *M. E. R.* 1906.
3. 65 of 1945–46.
4. See *E. I.* Vol. XVII. p. 307.
5. மற்றுப்பற்றெனக் கின்றிநின் றிருப்பாதமே மனம்
பாவித்தேன்,
பெற்றலும்பிறந் தேனினிப்பிறவாத தன்மை
வந்தெய்தினேன்,

Dharmapuri (Salem district) is, "in its style, so closely alike to Pallava structures of the 8th and 9th centuries A. D., that any casual observer with an eye to ancient architecture would not hesitate to pronounce it to be of the Later Pallava style,"[1] little is known of its builders. Mr. H. Krishna Sastri's view that the unique architecture of this temple is attributable to the Noḷambas of the 9th century[2] is not based on any epigraphical or other evidence.

Architecture and Sculpture :

The central shrine of the Raṅganātha temple at Namakkal "consists of rock-cut cave made up of (1) a raised platform with two pillars and two steps leading up to it, the base of the platform being cut into three tiers, (2) a hall with two pillars contiguous to (1) and (3) a small varandah beyond which the roof of the cave projects in a curve."[3] The temple contains a number of beautiful images representing Vishṇu, Brahmā, Nārada, Patañjali etc. The central shrine of the Lakshmīnarasimha temple on the hill at Namakkal "consists of a rock-cut cave with three sculptured cells, two pillars and a varandah in front."[4] The sculptures in this temple represent stories of Lord Vishṇu's different incarnations.

கற்றவர்தொழு தேத்துஞ் சீர்கறையூரிற் *பாண்டிக்*
கொடுமுடி,
நற்றவாஉனை நான்மறக்கினுஞ் சொல்லுநா
நமச்சிவாயவே!.

Sundarar's Dēvāram.

1. *M. E. R.* 1911. p. 4.
2. *Ibid.*
3. Paragraph 35 of *M. E. R.* 1906.
4. Paragraph 36 of *M. E. R.* 1906.

VII

THE WESTERN GAṄGAS

The subordination of some of the early W. Gaṅga kings to the Pallavas of Kāñchī is borne out by clear epigraphical evidence. Some scholars believe that even the founder of the W. Gaṅga dynasty, Koṅgaṇivarmaṉ alias Mādhava I was consecrated by a Pallava king to conquer the Bāṇa territory.[1] But, as we have seen in connection with the Bāṇas, there is no clear evidence for supporting this view. In any case, it is certain that the rise of the early Gaṅgas was not viewed with disfavour by the Pallavas.

Harivarmaṉ to Mādhava III.

It is possible that, sometime after the cessation of hostilities between Mayūraśarmaṉ and the Pallavas, the Bāṇas occupied that portion of the Anantapur district which was then known as Paruvi vishaya and ruled from Paruvi which may be identified with Pargi in the Hindupur taluk of that district.[2] At that time they are known to have been hostile to the Pallavas.[3] It was probably with a view to crush the Bāṇas that Pallava Simhavarmaṉ I consecrated the W. Gaṅga prince, Harivarmaṉ (*c.* A. D. 445–*c.* 460), son of

1. Dr. N. Arokiaswami – *Op. cit.* p. 165.
2. See *E. I.* Vol. XIV. p. 331. It was because of their association, during this period, with Paruvi that the Bāṇas were called the lords of Paruvipurī (i. e. Paruvi) – *S. I. I.* Vol. II. No. 76, v. 24.
3. A. S. M. 1936. Ins. No. 16.

Mādhava II.[1] There is no doubt that Harivarman was a vassal of the Pallava king.[2] About *c.* A. D. 450, the Pallava king succeeded in subduing the Bāṇas. In his efforts the Pallava king must have certainly received substantial help from his W. Gaṅga feudatory. The Penukoṇḍa plates definitely indicate that the Bāṇas were dispossessed of Paruvi vishaya and that the W. Gaṅgas held it.[3] The Digambara Jain manuscript, Lōkavibhāga which was copied in the 22nd year of Simhavarmaṉ i. e., Saka 380 at Pāṭalika in the Pāṇarāshṭra makes it clear that at that time i. e., A. D. 458 the Bāṇas were subordinate to the Pallavas and that, having left Paruvi vishaya, they had settled in the Pallava empire. The existence of Pānarāshtra as part of the Pallava empire in A. D. 458 leads us to conclude that the date of the subjugation of the Bāṇas must be somewhere A. D. 450.

Vishṇugōpa who succeeded Harivarmaṉ appears to have ruled only for a short period, say, five years. The Penukoṇḍa plates[4] the Kūḍlūr grant[5] and the Chūkuṭṭūr grant[6] are conspicuously silent on Vishṇugōpa though a number of

---

1. *The Classical Age*, p· 269; Dr. M. Arokiaswami *Op. cit.* p. 118. *J. M. U.* Vol. XII. pp. 136–40. Some scholars maintain that Simhavarmaṉ Pallava of the Penukoṇḍa plates must be the second king of that name (See *M. E. R.* 1914, paragraph 4; R. Gopalan - *Op. cit.* p. 66.
2. *E. I.* XIV. p. 333. Harivarmaṉ's name is spelt in different ways. Āyyavarma (*Ibid*), Arayavarmaṉ (*A. S. M.* Ins. No. 88) and Kṛishṇavarmaṉ. (*Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1924. No. 81.
3. *E. I.* Vol. XIV. No. 24.
4. *Ibid.* p. 336.
5. *A. S. M.* 1930. Ins. No. 88.
6. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1924. No. 81.

W. Gaṅga records refer to him.[1] Like his predecessor Vishṇugōpa also must have been a Pallava feudatory. Very little is known of his political activities.

Vishṇugōpa was followed by Mādhava III (*c.* A. D. 465 – *c.* 500) who was crowned by the Pallava king Śkandavarmaṇ III.[2] This W. Gaṅga king had another name, Śimhavarmaṇ, manifesting his subordination to the Pallavas.[3] He married the sister of Kṛishṇavarmaṇ who belonged to the collateral line of the Kadambas.[4] Mādhava III's matrimonial alliance with Kṛishṇavarmaṇ seems to have provoked the hostility of the main line of the Kadambas under Mṛigēśavarmaṇ (*c.* A. D. 475 – *c.* 490). The Halsi plates of Mṛigēśavarmaṇ dated in his 8th year states that he "uprooted the family of "Tuṅgagaṅga" and that he "was a very fire of destruction to the Pallavas".[5] The identification of Tuṅgagaṅga cannot be attempted in the present state of our knowledge. But it is highly probable that the W. Gaṅga king who ruled at the time of the conflict was Mādhava III. The record clearly indicates that there was hostility between the Pallavas and the main line of the Kadambas during the period under consideration. It is not unlikely that the former supported their W. Gaṅga feudatory in the war. As regards the result of the war the allies must have sustained defeat as the inscription suggests.

---

1. *P. I. H. C.* 1933. p. 517; *E. C.* Vol. IX, Dod-Ball. No. 67; *Ibid.* No. 68. *A. S. M.* 1930. Ins. No. 3; *Ibid.* No. 36; 93 of 1899.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XIV. p. 336.
3. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1924. No. 81.
4. *E. C.* Vol. IX. Dod-Ball. No. 68.
5. *I. A.* Vol. VI. p. 25.

Kṛishṇavarmaṇ, the father-in-law of Mādhava III, is known to have been defeated by the Pallavas.[1] We do not know whether this in any way affected Mādhava III's allegiance to the Pallavas. The coronation of Vishṇuvārmaṇ (*c.* A. D. 485 – 497), son of Kṛishṇavarmaṇ mentioned above, by a Pallava king[2] may suggest the continuance of Pallava hegemony over Gaṅgavāḍi also. Still some records of Mādhava including the latest known one[3] do not mention his connections with the Pallavas and this may raise a doubt whether he continued to be a Pallava vassal or not. But the evidences available do not help us in arriving at any definite conclusion.

Avanīta to Śivamāra II

Mādhava III's son and successor, Avanīta (*c.* A. D. 500 – *c.* 540) ascended the W. Gaṅga throne in his infancy. It is not known if he acknowledged Pallava paramountcy. It appears that he was not hostile to the Pallavas. One of his records[4] states that the mother of the Pallava king Simhavishṇu (*c.* A. D. 575 – *c.* 600) granted a village to a Jain temple for the benefit of her husband. Though it is certain that the Pallava queen belonged to thc Gaṅga territory, her exact relation to Avanīta is not clear.

Avanīta's son Durvinīta (*c.* A. D. 540 – *c.* 600) exhibited hostility towards the Pallavas and his successors followed the same policy.[5] In the first half of the 7th century Pulikēśin II conquered the W. Gaṅgas along with the Kadambas.[6] From that time onwards till the overthrow of the W. Chāḷukyas by

1. *The Classical Age.* p. 273.
2. *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1925. No. 118.
3. 1 of 1939–40.
4. *A. S. M.* 1938. pp. 80–90.
5. See M. V. Krishna Rao – *Op. cit.* pp. 37–39.
6. *E. I.* Vol. VI. pp. 8–10.

the Rāshṭrakūṭas we find the W. Gaṅgas figuring as the subordinate allies of the W. Chāḷukyas.[1] The rise of the Rāshṭrakūṭas was a menace to the W. Gaṅga kingdom. The danger made its first appearance even during the reign of Śrīpurusha.[2] His son Śivamāra II was engaged in a protracted war with Gōvinda III (A. D. 794 - 814). The cessation of hostilities about A. D. 813 is said to have been followed by Śivamāra's coronation by the Rāshṭrakūṭa and Pallava kings of his time. The Maṇṇe plates of Mārasimha I, son of Śivamāra II, refer to his father's coronation by Rāshṭrakūṭa Gōvinda III and Pallava Nandivarmaṉ.[3] The same information is also furnished by a later W. Gaṅga record.[4] The implications of the Pallava king's participation in the coronation of Śivamāra II are not clear. The supremacy of the Rāshṭrakūṭas over Gaṅgavāḍi was not disputed by the Pallavas. On the other hand the Pallavas themselves acknowledged in some form Rāshṭrakūṭa supremacy.[5] Whether the tribulations of Śivamāra II consequent on the invasion of his kingdom by the Rāshṭrakūṭas made him acknowledge the hegemony of the Pallavas or whether he was in any way related to the Pallavas cannot be said in the absence of any concrete evidence. As regards the date of the record L. Rice thinks that the grant may have been made in A. D. 797 to which year the details given in the record correspond and that the record would have been issued about A. D. 813 for

---

1. M. V. Krishna Rao - *Op. cit.*, pp. 47–54; Dr. M. Arokiaswami - *Op. cit.* pp. 150–152; *A. S. M.* 1939. Nos. 23 and 30.
2: *E. I.* Vol. XIII. pp. 275–282.
3. *E. C.* Vol. IX. Nl. 60.
4. *E. C.* Vol. IV. Yd. 60.
5. *I. A.* Vol. XI. p. 125.

it mentions the reinstatement of Śivamāra II by Gōvinda III which took place about A. D. 813.[1] In other words it is thought that the grant originally made at the time of the Rāshṭrakūṭa - W. Gaṅga struggle was confirmed with all formalities after the cessation of hostilities. In that case the Pallava king mentioned in the Maṇṇe plates must be Nandivarmaṇ III (*c.* A. D. 826 - 849) son ot Dantivarmaṇ. Dr. Fleet, however, thinks that Nandivarmaṇ of the Maṇṇe plates must be Nanivarmaṇ II and not his grandson.[2] It must be noted in this connection that the inscription itself is regarded by some scholars as a spurious one.[3]

Pṛithvīpati II and his successors.

Śivamāra II was followed not by his son but by his brother Vijayāditya I and the latter was succeeded by his son Rājamalla I. The succession of the younger branch to the throne was probably due to the fact that Pṛithivīpati I, son of Śivamāra, was very young at the time of his father's demise. Pṛithivīpati I's elder brother, Mārasimha I, seems to have predeceased his father.[4] We have seen in connection with the Bāṇas the probable date of Pṛithivīpati I's contact with the Pallavas, his matrimonial alliance with the Bāṇas under Vikramāditya I and his chief part in the battle of Sōremaṭi. It has also been noted that the Bāṇas were probably instrumental in bringing Pṛithivīpati I into close contact with the Pallavas.

Dr. Hultzsch thinks that Piṛudigaṅgaraiyar of the two Āmbūr inscriptions of Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṇ may be identified

1. *E. C.* Vol. IX. Intro. pp. 4–8.
2. See paragraph 6 of *M. E. R.* 1912.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Mys. Gaz.* Vol. II. pt. II. p. 647.

with Pṛithivīpati I.[1] This view is endorsed by V. Venkayya.[2] But the identification is incorrect because Piṛudigaṅgaraiyar of the Āmbūr inscriptions was a petty Gaṅga chief ruling over portions of the North Arcot district. He is identical with Pṛithivīgaṅgaraiyar of the Tippasamudram inscription[3] of Kō-Vijaya-Kampavarmaṉ. It is, however, certain that Pṛithivīpati I was a subordinate ally of the Pallavas. He played a significant part in the final contest between the Pāṇḍyas and the Pallavas at Śrīpuṟambiyam (Kumbakonam taluk) about A. D. 880. In that war Pṛithivīpati fought and died for the Pallavas. The Udayēndiram plates of his grandson describe his end as follows. "Having defeated by force the Pāṇḍya lord Varaguṇa at the head of the great battle of 'Śrīpuṟambiya', and having (thus) made (his) title Aparājita (i. e., the unconquered) significant, this hero entered the heaven of (his) friend (viz., Indra) by sacrificing his own life."[4] Pṛithivīpati I was followed by his son Mārasimha II (*c.* A. D. 880 - 895). During his period the relations between the Pallavas and the Chōḷas of Tanjore became strained. Mārasimha II seems to have sided with the Chōḷas. It is highly probable that Āditya I was assisted by the Gaṅga king in his conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam.[5] The Takkōlam inscription of Āditya I[6] dated in his 24th year (A. D. 895) recording a grant made by Pṛithivīpati II, son of Mārasimha points to the same conclusion. It is worthy of note that the Chōḷa king Āditya I does not claim to have conquered

---

1. *E. I.* Vol. IV. No. 23. p. 182.
2. Paragraph 9 of *M. E. R.* 1906.
3. 174 of 1939-40.
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. p. 387, v. 18.
5. See K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *Op. cit.* p. 114.
6. *E I.* Vol. XIX. No. 12, p. 88.

the successors of Pṛithivīpati I, probably because of his friendly relations with them after the battle of Śrīpuṟambiyam.

Individual Gaṅga Chiefs.

Apart from the W. Gaṅga rulers some individual Gaṅga chiefs also figure in Pallava records as the subordinates of the Pallavas. These chiefs were mostly confined to the North Arcot district. The Kuḷidikki inscription of Nandivarmaṉ II dated in his 52nd year mentions his Gaṅga feudatory by name Gaṅgadiyaraiyar Kaṉṉāḍu Peruṅgaṅgar who was the chief of Kaṟkāṭṭūr.[1] This chief fought and lost his life for the Pallava king in his war with the W. Gaṅgas.[2]

It is presumed that Śīyakaṉ who is mentioned in an undated inscription of Dantivarmaṉ from Tirupati was a Gaṅga feudatory of the Pallava king.[3] An inscription from Paḷḷikoṇḍa (Vellore taluk, N. Arcot district) of Nandivarmaṉ III[4] dated in his 2nd year states that Śelvaṉvāṉaraiyaṉ, son of Amaṉigaṅgaraiyar constructed a *mukhamaṇḍapa* probably for the Nāganāthēśvara temple at that place. It is not clear whether the chief mentioned in this record was a Gaṅga or Bāṇa chief.

The Śīyamaṅgalam inscription of Nandivarmaṉ III dated in his 3rd year refers to a Gaṅga chief called NērguṭṭiPerumāṉ.[5]

1. *E. I.* Vol. XXII, pp. 110–113.
2. *Ibid.* See also the chapter on the Bāṇas.
3. *T. T. etc. Devasthanam Inss.* Vol. I. No. 2 and Intro. p. 6. Another Gaṅga chief Raṇasiṅgaṉ who is metioned in an inscription from the same place is presumed to be a Pallava feudatory (*Ibid.* No. 5 and Intro. p. 6).
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 45.
5. *E. I.* Vol. VI. No. 32. Ins. B. Some scholars assign this record to Nandivarmaṉ II. (R.Gopalan, *Op cit.* Appe. A. No. 47).

The Śōḻapuram inscription of Kō-Vijaya-Kampavarmaṉ dated in his 8th year mentions a W. Gaṅga chief by name Pṛithivī Gaṅgaraiyar[1] who should be different from his name sake mentioned in the Āmbūr, Mēlpaṭṭi and Tippasamudram inscriptions.[2] It is not clear in what way he was related to the W. Gaṅga dynasty, particularly to Pṛithivīpati I. Nor do we know his part in the frontier wars of the Pallava empire. His son Rājāditya is known to have been a subordinate of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarmaṉ.[3]

Pṛithivīgaṅgaraiyar, another Gaṅga feudatory of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarmaṉ is mentioned in the Tippasamudram inscription.[4] He is most probably identical with the person of the same name mentioned in the Mēlpaṭṭi and Āmbūṛ inscriptions.[5] He must be different from his namesake referred to in the Śōḻapuram record of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarmaṉ for the latter passed away by the 8th regnal year of that Pallava king whereas the former figures in the inscriptions issued after that year.[6] He played an important part in the frontier wars of the Pallava empire. The Mēlpaṭṭi inscription[7] which records a conflict between the Bāṇas and this chief indicates that on one occasion he turned against the Pallavas. The Tippasamudram inscription of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarmaṉ issued seven years after Mēlpaṭṭi inscription shows that Pṛithivīgaṅgaraiyar was reduced to obedience. The

1. *E. I.* Vol. VII. p. 192.
2. *E. I.* Vol. IV. pp. 180–183; *E. I.* Vol. XXIII. pp. 143–147; 174 of 1939–40.
3. *E. I.* Vol. VII. p. 192.
4. 174 of 1939–40.
5. *E. I.* Vol. XXIII. pp. 143–147; *E. I.* Vol. IV. pp. 180–183.
6. See paragraph 6 of *M. E. R.* 1939–43.
7. *E. I.* Vol. XXIII. pp. 143–147.

former record states that this chief and his wife, Ilāḍap-perundēviyār constructed as the gift of their daughter, Ayyak-kuṭṭi, a channel called Viḻupparāraiyaṉ, from the river (S. Palar) to the tank at Valivalakkamaṅgalam which may be identified with Tippasamudram itself.[1]

Another W. Gaṅga chief known from inscriptions is Kō-Vijaya Narasimhavarmaṉ. He must have been a Pallava feudatory as his name indicates. The inference is supported by the fact that most of his records are found in the region over which the Pallavas exercised their sway. The dating of the records of this chief[2] in his own regnal years shows that his status was higher than that of an ordinary feudatory. This Gaṅga chief is assigned to the first half of the 9th century on the ground that the script of his records is referable to that period.[3] But he must have lived in the second half of the 9th century for his Baṅgavāḍi inscription[4] mentions the combatants who met at Sōremaṭi about A. D. 878. He supported the Bāṇas in their skirmishes with W. Gaṅgas and the Noḷambas.[5] It seems that he exercised his sway over Tagaḍūrnāḍu also.[6]

In fine the W. Gaṅga feudatories of the Pallavas helped them in subduing the Bāṇas in the 5th century and made common cause with the Pallavas against the main line of the Kadambas. The triumph of Pṛithivīpati I and the Bāṇas in the battle of Sōremaṭi (A. D. 878) contributed, to a great

---

1. Paragraph 6 of *M. E. R.* 1939–43.
2. *E. I.* Vol. IV, No. 22 and 52; 69 of 1933–34; *E. I.* Vol. VII. p. 22. Ins. A.
3. Paragraph 6 of *M. E. R.* 1933–34.
4. *E. I.* Vol. VII. pp. 22–23.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *E. I.* Vol. IV. p. 360.

extent, to the rift in the W. Gaṅga-Noḷamba alliance and thus averted possible dangers to the Pallava empire from those power. If the W. Gaṅga-Noḷamba combination had not been defeated at that battle the condition of the Pallava power in the last quarter of the 9th century would have been more precarious than it actually was. By far the most remarkable service of Pṛithivīpati to the Pallava empire was his heroic part in the battle of Śrīpuṟambiyam. In that war he fell fighting to the end for his overlord, Aparājita. But the successors of Pṛithivīpati I followed a very different policy. They did not stand by the Pallavas and seem to have sided with the Chōḷas of Tanjore. It is very likely that they contributed, though in a small measure, to the Chōḷa conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam in the reign of Āditya I.

As regards the individual Gaṅga chiefs they were not of great help to the Pallavas. They were not sufficiently strong to combat the Noḷamba inroads into the Pallava empire. Some of them played a hostile part as in the case of the later Pṛithivīgaṅgaraiyar. But their support to the Bāṇas must have contributed, to a certain extent, to the latter's victory at Sōremaṭi.

Culture :

Our account of the cultural role of these feudatories is meagre on account of paucity of information. The early W. Gaṅga feudatories of the Pallavas were noted for their patronage of Sanskrit learning. Many of their records are in Sanskrit language though in Kannaḍa script.[1] The Penu-koṇḍa plates describe Harivarmaṇ as having known "the essence of many Śāstras, Ithihāśas and Purāṇas."[2] The

1. e. g., *A. S. M.* 1930. Ins. No. 88 and *E. I.* XIV. No. 24.
2. *E. I.* Vol. XIV, p. 336, L. 6.

Keregalūr grant of Mādhava III[1] contains terms which are met with in the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya.[2] The same record describes Mādhava III's skill in polity as being "too deep even for those versed in the Arthaśāstra."[3] These go to prove that even in the 5th century A. D. the Sanskrit scholars of Gaṅgavāḍi were familiar with the great work of Kauṭilya. There are a number of inscriptions recording the gifts to pious scholars of the Gaṅga kings and chiefs.[4]

Buddhism :

The prevalence of Buddhism in Gaṅgavāḍi is borne out by epigraphical evidence. An inscription of Harivarmaṇ[5] refers to a Buddhist disputant Vādimadagajēndra who was vanquished by a Brāhmaṇ in philosophical disputation. A Sanskrit inscription of Mādhava III records his gift of lands to a Buddhist vihāra i. e., monastery and mentions a certain Buddhasatva who was perhaps connected with the institution.[6] Owing to great royal support, Jainism overshadowed Buddhism in Gaṅgavāḍi.

---

1. *A. S. M.* 1930. Ins. No. 3.
2. *Ibid.* p. 124.
3. *Ibid.* p. 117.
4. *I. A.* Vol. VIII. pp. 212–215; *A. S. M.* 1932 Ins. No. 1; *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1914–1915, paragraphs 61–63; *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1921, paragraphs 38 and 39 – this record is considered to be a spurious one; *E. I.* Vol. XIV. No. 24; *A. S. M.* 1930. Ins. Nos. 3. and 88; *Mys. Arch· Rep.* 1924 pp. 79–81; 392 of 1940–41; 326 of 1912; *E. I.* Vol. IV. No..22. Ins. A.
5. *I. A.* Vol. VIII. pp. 212–215.
6. Paragraphs 47–50 of *Mys. Arch. Rep.* 1909–10.

Jainism :

In Gaṅgavāḍi Jainism was very popular and enjoyed the lion's share of royal patronage. Digambara Jains were numerous. They maintained close contact with their brethren in other parts of South India. There were several Jain temples and monasteries. An inscription of Mādhava III states that on the advice of Vīradēva, a Jain sage, the king made a grant of lands to the Arhad temple established by the Mūlaśaṅgha in the Perbboḷal village of the Mudukottūr vishaya.[1] Despite the fact that Pallava political influence in Gaṅgavāḍi disappeared in the middle of the 5th century, the Jains maintained close cultural contact with the Pallava empire as evidenced by the Pallava architectural and sculptural influences that we find in some W. Gaṅga Jain temples of later period.[2]

Śaivism and Vaishṇavism :

The epigraphs of the early W. Gaṅgas clearly show that there must have been large number of the followers of Śaivism and Vaishṇavism in Gaṅgavāḍi. Scholars belonging to these denominations were patronised by the kings. Mādhava III worshipped Śiva[3] and was well-known for his renewal of Brāhmaṇ endowments long since ceased.[4] An inscription from Śīyamaṅgalam (South Arcot district) of VijayaNandi-vikramavarmaṇ dated in his third year states that Aḍavi, the headman of Tiruppālaiyūr, erected a *maṇḍapa* in front of the Śthambēśvara temple (at Śīyamaṅgalam) with the permission

1. *E. C.* X Malur 73.
2. The Pañchakūṭā Basti at Kambadahaḷḷi, Nāgamaṅgala taluk, is a good example. See A. S. M. 1939. p. 45.
3. *E. C.* Vol. IX. p. 7.
4. *E. I.* Vol. IX. Dod. Ball. 67.

of the Gaṅga king Nērguṭṭi Perumāṉ. Obviously Aḍavi was a subject of the Gaṅga chief who was feudatory to the Pallava king Nandivarmaṉ III.[1] The Śōḻapuram inscription of Kō-Vijaya Kampavarmaṉ dated in his 8th year records that Rājāditya, son of Pṛithivīgaṅgaraiyar constructed a Śiva temple in memory of his deceased father.[2]

Vishṇugōpa who was celebrated for his saintly qualities was an ardent follower of Vaishṇavism and was "devoted to the worship of Gurus, Cows and Brāhmaṇas."[3] We have already noted that Dantivarmaṉ's feudatory, Śīyakaṉ, made a grant to the Vishṇu temple at Tirupati.[4] It is thus clear that in matters of religion the W. Gaṅga feudatories of the Pallavas were not merely tolerant but even liberal.

---

1. See *E. I.* Vol. VI. No. 32.
2. *E. I.* Vol. VII. p. 192.
3. *E. C.* Vol. X. Malur 73.
4. *T. T. etc. Devasthanam Inss.* Vōl. I. No. 2.

VIII

INDIVIDUAL FEUDATORIES.

Besides the feudatory dynasties noted above, some individual chiefs are also known to have been subordinate to the Pallavas. All the available information regarding such chiefs and their services to the Pallava empire is given below in chronological order.

The undated Vallam inscription of Mahēndravarmaṉ I mentions one of his vassals by name Śkandasēna, son of Vasantapriyarāja.[1] Śkandasēna excavated the Śiva cave temple at Vallam near Chingleput.[2] This temple is one of the oldest temples of the Tamil country.

Some of the Muṉaiya chiefs or Muṉaiyaraiyars who exercised their sway over what was then known as Tirumuṉaippāḍi-nāḍu (S. Arcot district) were subordinate to the Pallavas. Narasiṅga Muṉaiyar, the foster-father of St. Śundarar, one of the Dēvaram trio, must have been a feudatory of the Pallava king Narasimhavarmaṉ II.[3] Another Muṉaiya chief figures in an inscription of Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṉ.

Much is not known about the chiefs of Chēdi-naḍu (S. Arcot district) whose territory was probably subject to Pallava influence though no record of the Pallavas before the

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. No. 72. pp. 340–341; paragraph 7 of *M. E. R.* 1893; *J. O. R.* Vol. VII. p. 230.
2. *Ibid.*
3. See *Tamil Poḻil.* Vol. III. pp. 201–209.

time of Narasimhavarmaṉ II, is found there. According to the *Periyapurāṇam*, Meypporuḷ Nāyaṉār who lived in the interval between St. Sambandar and St. Sundarar, was a chief of Chēdi-nāḍu. It is possible that he was a Pallava vassal. In the period of Chōḷa ascendancy the Chēdi chiefs figure very prominently.[1]

Udayachandra, the lord of the river Vēgavati and of the city of Vilvala,[2] was one of the leading feudatories of Nandivarmaṉ II. It seems that he held sway over portions of the Chingleput and North Arcot districts. The Udayēndiram plates which testify to his loyalty and prowess states that the Pūchaṉ family to which Udayachandra belonged had been in uninterrupted hereditary service of the Pallavas. As regards his services to the Pallava king, the plates describe as follows: "when he (Udayachandra) perceived that Pallavamalla was besieged in Nandipura by the Dramiḷa princes, unable to bear this, like the visible death of the crowd of the enemies of Pallavamalla, (he) slew with (his) sharp sword............the Pallava king Chitramāya and others; he defeated the hostile army on the battle-fields of Nimbavana, Chūtavana, Saṁkaragrāma, Nellūr, Nelvēli, Śūrāvaṟundūr and so forth, and (thus) bestowed the whole kingdom many times on the Pallava .... spilt the opposing Śabara king, Udayana, in the terrible battle of Nelvēli, which could hardly be entered by a common man and seized (his) mirror-banner made of a peacock's tail; who in the Northern region also, pursued the Nishada chief, called Pṛithivīvyāgra who desiring to become very powerful was running after the horse of the Aśvamēdha,

1. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri - *Op cit.* p. 430.
2. This place is identified with Vilvalaṅgara-Villivalam. in the Chingleput district. See R. Gopalan. *Op. cit.* p. 124. F.n. 3.

defeated (him) and ordered (him) out of the district (vishaya) of Vishṇurāja (which) he subjected to the Pallava, and seized faultless pearl necklaces of excellant lustre, an immeasurable heap of gold, and elephants; (and) who destroyed (the fort of) Kāḷidurga, which was protected by the Goddess Kāḷi and defeated the Pāṇḍya army at the village of Maṇṇaikuḍi."[1]

As regards the places where Udayachandra achieved victories for the Pallava king, Nimbavana, Chūtavana, Saṁkaragrāma and Maṇṇaikuḍi may be identified respectively with Vēppaṅgāḍu, Kōvilūr, Saṅkaraṇārkuḍikāḍu (Pattukkottai taluk) and Maṇṇaikuḍi (Arantangi taluk) in the Tanjore district.[2] Śūrāvaṟundūr may be provisionally identified with Śurāviḷundur in the Chidambaram taluk of the South Arcot district.[3] Dr. Hultzsch regards the Śabara king as a Tamil chieftain and identifies Nelvēli with modern Tinnevelly.[4] If the Śabara king was a Tamil chieftain, we may identify Nelvēli with the village of the same name in the Arantangi taluk of the Tanjore district. But, if as Mr. R. Gopalan says,[5] the Śabaras are identical with the modern Sauras of the Ganjam and Vizagapatam districts, it would not be possible to identify Nelvēli with any place in the Tamil country; we must look for it either in the Telugu country or in the region bordering on it. As regards the Nishāda chief, he must be different from the Nishāda chieftains of the former Pudukkottai state for the campaigns against him are known to have taken place in the region to

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. 3. p. 372.
2. R. Gopalan. *Op. cit.* pp. 125-126. *Contra.* K. R. Venkatrama Aiyar. *J. O. R.* Vol. XIX. p. 192.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. 3. p. 364.
5. *The Pallavas.* p. 125.

the north of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. It is possible that the battle between this chief and the Pallava general took place at Nellūr (Nellore district). Dr. D. C. Sircar suggests that Pṛithivīvyāgara, the Nishāda chief might be a Nala king.[1] Vishṇuraja mentioned in the plates may be identified with the Eastern Chāḷukya king Vishṇuvardhana III (A. D. 709-746).[2] It is not possible to identify the fort of Kāḷidurga which was destroyed by Udayachandra. Dr. Hultzsch rejects its identification with Kōḻikkōḍu (Calicut).[3] Lastly our conclusion regarding the identification of the places and persons mentioned in the Udayēndiram plates are bound to be tentative in the present state of our knowledge.

There is, however, no doubt about the fact that Udayachandra had borne the chief part in stabilizing the position of Nandivarmaṇ II as a ruler and in crushing his powerful and numerous enemies. The Udayēndiram plates record the grant to one hundred and eight Brāhmaṇas of the village of Kumāramaṅgala-Veḷḷāttūr in the Paśchimāśrayanadī vishaya and two water levers in the village of Koṟṟagrāma and state that the gifted village was named after Udayachandra.[4] The grant was made by the Pallava king at the request of Udayachandra.

Another copper-plate record from Pullūr (Polur taluk, N. Arcot district) dated in the 33rd year of Nandivarmaṇ II states that at the request of Avaṇichandra Yuvarāja, the lord of Vilvalapura, the Pallava king made the grant to one hundred and eight Brāhmaṇas of the four villages, Nelli,

---

1. *The Classical Age*. p. 254. F.n. No. 1.
2. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. 3. p. 364.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. II. pt. 3. p. 372.

Pullūr, Kuḍiyūr and Takkār in Pālkuṉṟa-Kōṭṭam, clubbed them together into one unit and named it Nayadhīramaṅgalam after one of his surnames.[1] There is no doubt that Avaṉichandra of this record was a vassal of the Pallava king. Vilvalapura mentioned in the record may be identified with Vilvala of the Udayēndiram plates. It is probable that Avaṉichandra was the son Udayachandra.[2] The fact that the findspot of the record is close to the village of Udayēndiram seems to support this view.[3] It is not unlikely that Avaṉichandra of the Pullūr record is identical with his namesake mentioned in an inscription from Kāñchīpuram[4] dated in the 17th year of Dantivarmaṉ.[5]

Another feudatory of Nandivarmaṉ II was the chief of Maṅgala-nāḍu who is mentioned in the Paṭṭattāḷmaṅgalam plates.[6] The plates record that at the request of Maṅgalanāḍāḷvāṉ and the Āṇatti of Ālappākka-Vijayanallūḷāṉ, king Vijaya-Nandi-Vikramavarmaṉ issued an order in the 61st year of his reign to the nāṭṭār of Āravala-Kūṟṟam in Chōḷa-nāḍu, granting as brahmadēya 40 velis of land which included two old brahmadēyas granted in the 59th year of the same king at the request of Maṅgalanāḍāḷvāṉ and the Āṇatti of Ālappāka-Vijayanallūḷāṉ.[7] It is also recorded in the plates that the brahmadēya was constituted as a new village under the name of Paṭṭattāḷmaṅgalam. As the villages in Āravala-Kūṟṟam are mostly found in the Negapatam taluk,

1. 9 of 1939–40 (copper plates).
2. Paragraph 5 of *M. E. R.* 1939–43.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. IV. No. 132.
5. Paragraph 5 of *M. E. R.* 1939–43.
6. *E. I.* Vol. XVIII. pp. 115–124.
7. *Ibid.* p. 116.

Paṭṭattāḷmaṅgalam also must be in the same taluk.[1] Maṅgala-nāḍu must have comprised the region in and around the village Maṅgal in the Tanjore district. Though the chief of Maṅgala-nāḍu is described as "a great hero, virtuous and respected by the good", his martial exploits are not known.

An inscription from Toṇḍūr (Ginjee taluk, S. Arcot district) dated in the 6th year of Dantivarmaṉ registers a gift of 16 kaḷañju of gold by Viṇṇakōvaraiyar, a feudatory chief, to provide from the interest on the amount, offerings to Ēṟṟukkuṉṟaṉār Bhaṭṭāri for the merit of certain persons.[2] The Kāñchīpuram record of the same Pallava king refers to a gift of gold made by Avaṉichandra.[3]

A fragmentary epigraph from Kāvērippākkam (Arakonam taluk, N. Arcot district) dated in the 13th year of Nandivarmaṉ III records a gift of gold by the daughter-in-law of Ayyakki Paṅgaḷa Aḍigaḷ.[4] It is presumed that Ayyakki Paṅgaḷa Aḍigaḷ was the chief of Paṅgaḷa-nāḍu which comprised a portion of the present N. Arcot district.[5] In that case he must be a feudatory of the Pallava king.

The Marudāḍu inscription (Wandiwash taluk, N. Arcot district) of Nṛipatungavarmaṉ dated in his 12th year records that a certain Koṅgaraiyar Niṉṟaperumāṉ constructed a weir to the tank at Marudāḍu and renovated the sluice.[6] It is not known if this chief was a Gaṅga one. Another record from Paramēśvaramaṅgalam (Madurantakam taluk, Chingleput

1. *Ibid.* p. 119.
2. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 42; 283 of 1916.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. IV. No. 132; 34 of 1888.
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 50; 406 of 1905.
5. Intro. to No. 50 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XII.
6. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 65; 417 of 1912.

district) of the same Pallava king dated in his 16th year states that the committee (Gaṉapperumakkaḷ) of the temple called Śailēśvaram agreed to provide offerings during the mid-day service of the god Mahādēva at Śailēśvaram in Paramēśvaramaṅgalam in lieu of the interest on 11 kaḻañju of gold received by them from Nandi-Niṟaimati, son of Maṉṉaikuḍi-Maṟamaḍakki Viḻupperaraiyar.[1] It is surmised that the title, Maṉṉaikuḍi-Maṟamaḍakki, perfixed to the name Viḻupperaraiyar apparently refers to the battle at Maṉṉaikuḍi in which a Pāṇḍya king was defeated by Udayachandra, the general of Nandivarmaṉ II and that one of the ancestors of Viḻupperaraiyar took part in that battle.[2] Mr. V. Venkatasubba Ayyar who does not contradict this view expresses another possibility; he thinks that Maṉṉaikuḍi and Maṟamaḍakki might be the native village and hamlet of Viḻupperaraiyar and as such find mention in the record. Villages having the same names are indeed found in the Arantangi taluk of the Tanjore district. Nevertheless the former view is probable for generally in inscriptions only one village of the donor is mentioned.

The Tiruvadi inscription (Cuddalore taluk, S. Arcot district) of Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṉ dated in his 16th year states that Muṉaiyakōṉiḷavaraiyaṉ, son of Muṉaippēraraiyar, a resident of Peruṅguḷattūr, repaired the temple of Tiruvīraṭṭāṉam and endowed gold for a perpetual lamp.[3] As Muṉaippēraraiyar is spoken of in the record as living at Peruṅguḷattūr, he must be a contemporary feudatory of the Pallava king.

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, No. 69; 257 of 1912.
2. Paragraph 11 of *M. E. R.* 1913.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. VIII. No. 308; 35 of 1903.

The Tiruvoṟṟiyūr record of the same Pallava king dated in his 18th year registers a gift of gold to the Śiva temple at Tiruvoṟṟiyūr (Saidapet taluk, Chingleput district) by Paḻiyaṉ pilli, wife of Viḍēlviḍugu Pallavaraiyar.[1] Obviously Viḍēl-viḍugu Pallavaraiyar was a Pallava vassal probably in charge of Umbaḷa-nāḍu which is referred to in the inscription.[2]

An inscription from Tiruchcheṉṉampūṇḍi (Tanjore taluk) of Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṉ dated in the 22nd year records a gift of gold for a perpetual lamp to the God of Tirukkaḍaimuḍimā by Veṭṭuvadiyaraiyar of Koṇḍa-nāḍu.[3] Another inscription from Tirukkōḍikāval (Kumbakoṇam taluk, Tanjore district) dated in the 24th year of the same Pallava king registers an agreement made by the assembly of Nāraṇakka-Chaturvēdi-maṅgalam to burn a perpetual lamp in the temple of Mahādēva at Tirukkōḍikāvu for the interest on 15 kaḻañju of gold received by them from Veṭṭuvadiraiyaṉ alias Mallaṉ Vēṅgaḍavaṉ of Koṇḍa-nāḍu.[4] It is practically certain that the chief mentioned in this record is identical with his name-sake referred to in the preceding inscription. From other epigraphical evidences it is known that Koṇḍa-nāḍu was a subdivision of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam.[5] Two inscriptions from Kīḻūr (Tirukkoyilur taluk, S. Arcot district) of Veṭṭuvadiya-raiyars are dated in the 3rd year but do not mention any overlord.[6] It is not impossible that these two records belong to the latter part of Aparājita's reign. If this view is correct, the inscriptions may be taken to indicate the independent

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 70; 162 of 1912.
2. See Intro. to No. 70 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XII.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. VII. No. 522; 301 of 1901.
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 78; 22 of 1930–31.
5. See *S. I. I.* Vol. VII. No. 933.
6. *Ibid.* Nos. 933 ane 934.

position of the Veṭṭuvadiyaraiyars. Nothing is known of the part played by these chiefs in the overthrow of the Pallava power by Āditya I. But their subordination to the Chōḷas in the subsequent period is borne out by some epigraphical evidence.[1] It is highly improbable that the Veṭṭuvadiyaraiyars were identical with the Bāṇas.[2]

Two epigraphs from Uttiramērūr (Chingleput district), one dateless and damaged[3] and the other incomplete and dated in the 26th year,[4] of Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṉ refer to a feudatory chief by name Vijayanallūḷāṉ Kāḍavadiyaraiyaṉ alias Būdi-dhīraṉ who belonged to Kūkūr in Mīkūṟṟuviḷanāḍu in the Muttaraiya country. Vijayanallūḷāṉ of this record must be different from his namesake mentioned in the Paṭṭattāḷmaṅgalam plates of Nandivarmaṉ II. Būdi-dhīraṉ does not appear to be a Muttaraiya chief.

An inscription from Satyavēḍu (Ponneri taluk, Chingleput district) dated in the 4th year of Aparājitavarmaṉ registers a gift of the village Tuṟaiyūr including its income in gold and kind for conducting worship in the temple of Mahādēva at Tirumataṅganpaḷḷi in Tekkūr-nāḍu, a subdivision of Paiyyur-iḷaṅkōṭṭam by Kumārandai Kuṟumbarādittaṉ alias Kāḍu-paṭṭippēraraiyaṉ who belonged to Chēra-nāḍu.[5] The village Tuṟaiyūr is identified with the village of the same name in the Madurantakam taluk of the Chingleput district.[6] Another record from the same place dated in the 5th year of the same

---

1. 104 of 1940–41.
2. *Contra* – paragraph 26 of *M. E. R.* 1939–43.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. VI. No. 367.
4. *Ibid.* No. 368.
5. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 86; 31 of 1912.
6. Intro. to No. 85 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XII.

Pallava king records a gift of 100 sheep for burning a perpetual lamp in the same temple by Pōṟṟinaṅgai, wife of Kumārandai Kuṟumbarādita̱n alias Kāḍupaṭṭipperaraiya̱n.[1] Obviously the chief mentioned in this record is identical with his namesake mentioned in the preceding record. He is stated to have belonged to Chēra-nāḍu. We do not know how he came into contact with the Pallava king. But there is no doubt about his subordination to the Pallava king for the two records are dated in the regnal year of the latter. It is suggested that the chief might be a member of the Pallava dynasty.[2] Another inscription from Tiruvoṟṟiyūr (Saidapet taluk, Chingleput district) dated in the 8th year of Aparājita registers an endowment of 60 kaḻañju of gold by Paitāṅgi Kaṇḍa̱n, chief of Kāṭṭūr in Vaḍakarai-Iṉṉambar-nāḍu, a subdivision of Chōḷa-nāḍu for providing on the day of his natal star Svāti, offerings to the deity and for burning a perpetual lamp in the temple of Mahādēva at Tiruvoṟṟiyūr.[3] The offerings included rice, ghee, plantains, sugar, vegetables, arecanuts, betel-leaves, tender coconuts, Pañchagavya, sandal paste and camphor. Iṉṉambar-nāḍu must have comprised the region in and around the present village, Iṉṉambur in the Kumbakonam taluk of the Tanjore district. The record under consideration testifies to the continuance of Pallava supremacy over the Chōḷa country. A fourth record of Aparājita from Nemali (Tiruttani division, Chittoor district) dated in his 10th year registers a gift of land for playing musical instruments during Śrībali ceremonies in the four temples (of the place) by Sāttandai Śuttamalla̱n alias Aṉuttira-pallavaraiya̱n of Singapuram.[4] A dateless inscription from

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 89; 32 of 1912.
2. Paragraph 10 of *M. E. R.* 1912.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 92; 159 of 1912.
4. 154 of 1942–43.

Tirunāmanallūr (Tirukkoyilur taluk, S. Arcot district) records a grant of land as archanābhōga by Muṉaiyadaraiyaṉ alias Aparājitaṉ Kulamāṇikkaṉ Mahādēvaṉ.[1] Since the record does not mention any overlord, it is doubtful if the chief mentioned in the record was a feudatory of Aparājita. If the inscription be assignable to the reign of Aparājita, it may be taken to indicate the assumption by the Muṉaiya chief of independence perhaps some time before Aprājita's conflict with his overmighty Chōḷa feudatory, Āditya I.

An inscription from Tiruvoṟṟiyūr dated in the 9th year of Kō-Vijaya-Kampavarmaṉ registers a gift of 30 kaḻañju of gold by Amarnidi alias Pallavadiyaraiyar of Kañjaṉūr in the Indaḷūr-nāḍu, and another gift of a similar amount by a person whose name is lost in the record, for two perpetual lamps in the Śiva temple at Tiruvoṟṟiyūr.[2] Apparently Amarnidi must have been a minor feudatory chief. Kañjaṉūr may be identified with the village of the same name in the Kumbakonam taluk.[3] Indaḷūr-nāḍu must have comprised the region in and around the village Indaḷūr (Tanjore taluk) including Kañjaṉūr.

---

1. 230 of 1939–40.
2. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII. No. 100; 188 of 1912.
3. Intro. to No. 100 of *S. I. I.* Vol. XII.

A NOTE ON THE CHRONOLOGY AND GENEALOGY OF THE PALLAVAS FROM NANDIVARMAṆ II.

The chronology and genealogy of the Pallavas, like those of the Pāṇḍyas of the post-Śaṅgam period, are still to a considerable extent uncertain. It is proposed here to analyse the chronology and genealogy of the Pallavas from Nandivarmaṇ II. Even for starting our analysis from Nandivarmaṇ II we have to go back a little. The present writer follows the schemes furnished by Mr. R. Gopalan in his work, 'History of the Pallavas of Kāñchi'. But Gopalan's schemes, particularly the chronological one, have been seriously modified by many scholars on different grounds. Some scholars are disposed to examine a particular aspect of the problem overlooking the other aspects. But such an approach will not solve the problems. We shall therefore make a comprehensive, but brief, study of the problems examining one by one the important views connected with them.

In his article on the 'Date of the Accession of Nandivarmaṇ II Pallavamalla'[1] Dr. N. Venkataramanayya discusses Mr. K.V. Subramanya Aiyar's date of the accession of Nandivarmaṇ II, dismisses it relying on the data of the Mallam inscription of Nandipōttaraśar[2] and the Maṇṇe plates of Mārasimha I[3] and assumes that A. D. 725 should be the first regnal year of Nandivarmaṇ II.[4] The conclusions of Dr. Venkataramanayya are mainly based on the two records mentioned above. As regards the first the details must be fully analysed and for that a translation of the record is given below.

---

1. *J. O. R.* Vol. VIII. pp. 1-8.
2. *N. D. I.* Vol. I. p. 429. Gudur 54.
3. *E. C.* Vol. IX. N.A. 60.
4. *J. O. R.* Vol. VIII. p. 7.

"Prosperity. In the 15th year of the reign of Nandipōttaraśar, we, the men of the district (nāḍu), the villagers and the heads of assemblies, gave at the order of Chaḷukkiaraśar on the petition of Āḷuvaaraśar to (the God) Subramaṇya at Tiruvānbur (situated) in Paiyyurilangōṭṭam, 35 Kaḷañju of gold given by Maduvār for (maintaining) lamps(?)"[1]

Nandipōttaraśar referred to in the record is doubtless Nandivarmaṉ II. Since the record is dated in his regnal year it is certain that, at the time when it was issued, the Mallam area must have been under his rule. It is not clearly known whether the Chaḷukkiaraśar of the inscription was an ally or a vassal of the Pallava king. Dr. Venkataramanayya rejects Mr. V. Venkayya's view that the Chaḷukkiaraśar of the record was an Eastern Chāḷukya subordinate of Nandivarmaṉ II and thinks that he belonged to the Bādāmi branch of the Chāḷukya family.[2] What made the Chaḷukkiaraśar acknowledge the friendship or overlordship of the Pallava king is not known. There is clear evidence[3] that the Chāḷukyas of Bādāmi regarded the Pallavas as their hereditary enemies. If Dr. Venkataramanayya's view is accepted the record under consideration may be treated as the sole evidence of the solitary instance of Pallava - W. Chāḷukya friendship. But the present writer thinks that the identification of Chaḷukkiaraśar suggested by Dr. Venkataramanayya is highly problematical. In fact Dr. Venkataramanayya himself states that "no instance of a Bādāmi Chāḷukyan king becoming a subordinate of a Pallava after the time of Narasimha I is known."[4]

1. *N. D. I.* Vol. I. p. 429, Gudur 54.
2. *J. O. R.* Vol. VIII. pp. 4 and 5.
3. *E. I.* Vol. IX, No. 28, p. 205.
1. *J. O. R.* Vol. VIII, p. 4.

Identifying Chaḷukkiaraśar of this inscription with Vikramāditya II (A. D. 733-45) and supposing that the inscription was inscribed during the course of his first invasion of Kāñchī in A. D. 733-34 Dr. Venkataramanayya states that the 15th regnal year of Nandivarmaṇ II falls in A. D. 733-34 and as such his accession could not have happened before A. D. 718-719. He further states that "at the same time we must keep in mind that his accession could have taken place at any time between this date and A. D. 730-31"[1]

Now, two things remain to be noted here. One is the identification of Chaḷukkiaraśar with Vikramāditya II. This is only a conjecture of Dr. Venkataramanayya and is not based on any definite evidence. The other is Vikrmāditya II's invasion of the Pallava empire. He is known to have invaded the Pallava empire thrice. We do not know for certain whether the invasion referred to by Dr. Venkataramanayya was the first or second or third of the invasions of Vikramāditya II. Nor do we possess any evidence about the exact dates of these invasions. As regards Nandivarmaṇ II's last regnal year Dr. Venkataramanayya relies wholly on the Maṇṇe plates of the Western Gaṅga prince Mārasimha I, son of Śivamāra II. Dr. Venkataramanayya believes that the release and coronation of Śivamāra II by Govinda III went together, that the coronation took place in A. D. 789 and that Nandivarmaṉ referred to in the Maṇṇe plates must be Nandivarmaṇ II. Further, he assumes that the Pallava king must have died in A. D. 790 and therefore his accession must have taken place in A. D. 725.[2]

---

1. *Ibid.* pp. 4 and 5.
2. *Ibid.* p. 7.

Both Dr. Fleet and Louis Rice regard the Maṇṇe plates as a spurious record. Both consider the coronation of Śivamāra II by the Rāshṭrakūṭa and Pallava kings of his time as a probable one but both think that the event could not have taken place towards the close of the 8th century but must have happened in the early years of the next century.[1] Further according to Dr. Altekar the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Gōvinda III came to power only in A. D. 793 and this precludes all possibility of Śivamāra II's coronation taking place before that year. Obviously the conclusions of Dr. Venkataramanayya are based on very doubtful testimony.

Without discussing the problem, Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri gives the following chronology of the later Pallavas in his *History of South India* (p. 163)

" Narasimhavarman II	A. D. 680—720
Paramēśvaravarman II	720—731
Nandivarman II	731—795
Dantivarman	795—845
Nandivarman III	844—866
Nṛipatuṅgavarman	855—896
Aparājita	879—897 "

Prof. Sastri's views on the dates of Narasimhavarmaṉ II and Paramēśvaravarmaṉ II require careful examination on account of their bearings on the date of Nandivarmaṉ II. On the basis of some late Chinese evidence given and examined in his work, *Foreign Notices of South India,* Prof. Sastri assigns a long reign - 40 years, to Narasimhavarmaṉ II. As for the evidence '*Tso' fou Yuan Kouei*', a great Chinese

1. *E. C.* Vol. IX. Intro. p. 4; *E. I.* Vol. V. No. 18. p. 161.

encyclopaedia compiled about A. D. 1013, it contains many references to Narasimhavarmaṉ II's relations with China.[1] According to the first reference the Pallava king proposed in A. D. 720 to the Chinese emperor to place his war elephants and cavalry at his disposal for chastising the Arabs and Tibetans and asked him to give a name to his army, and the emperor named it "the army which cherished virtue"[2] It is surprising that Narasimhavarmaṉ II should have proposed to the Chinese emperor to extend his military assistance against the Arabs and Tibetans for they were not, as Prof. Sastri himself says, the enemies of any South Indian state either in the 7th century A. D. or in the next century. Prof. Sastri draws a very different inference from this datum. He surmises that the Chinese court was anxious to enlist Narasimhavarmaṉ II's support in its plans against Tibetans.[3] But it may be said that in the light of persistent hostility between the Pallavas and W. Chāḷukyas Narasimhavarmaṉ II would not have proposed to extend any military aid to the Chinese emperor. Prof. R. C. Majumdar is of opinion that the embassy of Yaśovarmaṉ of Kanauj and of Lalitāditya of Kashmir, sent to China in the first half of the 8th century, might have asked for Chinese help against the Arabs and Tibetans.[4] Since Yaśovarmaṉ was at war with the Arabs he might have done so. In that case the Chinese chronicler must have confused in his account the activities at the Chinese court of the several embassies sent from different parts of India. But it must be accepted that there is nothing improbable in the statement that Narasimhavarmaṉ II sent

1. Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *F. N. S. I.* p. 116.
2. *Ibid.* p. 116.
3. *Ibid.* Intro. p. 17.
4. *The Classical Age.* p. 130..

an embassy to China, though the purpose, date and other details of it are not known for certain.

In the second passage[1] we find a reference to the tribute made by the Pallava king to the Chinese emperor. This need not be regarded as an evidence of Pallava subordination to the Chinese. To make presents to the ruler of a country by the envoy or ambassador of another country was very common in those days. Some such presents made by the Pallava embassy to the Chinese emperor must have been mistaken by later Chinese chroniclers as tribute. According to this passage the Pallava embassy was at the Chinese court in A. D. 720.

According to the third passage[2] the Chinese emperor conferred on the Pallava king the title, 'King of the kingdom of South India'.

Kieon T'ang Chou, another Chinese work, states that Narasimhavarmaṉ II constructed a temple 'on account of the Chinese empire' and addressed the Chinese emperor to give a name to it. The Chinese emperor decided that the name of the temple should be 'which causes return to virtue' – (Koeihoa)[3]. The temple said to have been built by the Pallava king 'on account of the Chinese empire' must have been a Buddhist one. But no epigraph of Narasimhavarmaṉ II refers to his erection of a Buddhist temple. It is very doubtful whether Narasimhavarmaṉ, one of the most ardent Śaiva kings of the period, would at a time when there was no love lost between the Saivas and the Buddhists of the Tamil country, have

1. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *Op. cit.* p. 116.
2. *Ibid.* p. 117.
3. *Ibid.* p. 117.

attempted to build a Buddhist temple in his country for the sole purpose of pleasing the ruler of a distant oversea empire from whom he had neither trouble nor assistance of any kind to expect.[1]

The testimony of Ma-Twan-lin[2] which Prof. Sastri regards as confirmatory does not at all confirm the details given above regarding Narasimhavarmaṇ's embassy to China. The account of Ma-Twan-Jin does not mention the name of Narasimhavarmaṇ. According to it the Five Indias sent ambassadors to the court of the Chinese emperor and 'an ambassador from Central India proceeded three times as far as the extremity of South India and came only once (to the Chinese court) to offer birds of five colours that could talk"[3] It is also said that he applied for aid against the Arabs and Tibetans that he offered to take the command of the auxiliary troops and that he was given the rank of General-in-Chief.[4]

It will be clear from what has been said above that the Chinese writers must have certainly confused the transactions at the Chinese court of the embassies sent from various parts of India. Naturally we cannot rely for fixing the date of the Pallava king on such a defective and late evidence. In fact Prof. Sastri himself points out some of the glaring defects of the Chinese evidences.[5]

---

1. *Contra* – V. Venkatasubba Ayyar, *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, Intro. p. IV.
2. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *Op. cit.*, p. 117.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. *Ibid.* Intro. pp. 16 and 17.

Again Prof. Sastri identifies Narasimhavarmaṉ II's embassy to China with the mission of the Buddhist preceptor Vajrabodhi.[1] While Prof. Sastri thinks that Vajrabodhi was a South Indian, Mr. P. C. Bagchi regards him as a North Indian, son of Īśāṉavarmaṉ, king of Central India.[2] But Vajrabodhi's contact with the Pallava king is highly probable. It is not known whether Vajrabodhi was identical with the ambassador sent from Central India to China and referred to in the pages of Ma-Twan-lin. Vajrabodhi's voyage to China appears to have been prolonged. His arrival at Canton in A. D. 720 coupled with the long delay that occurred during his voyage indicates that he must have left the Pallava country some years before A. D. 720.[3] If the exact date of his departure from the Pallava country were known, it can enable us to know a little better about the duration of Narasimhavarmaṉ II's reign.

Above all we do not possess any lithic or copper-plate record of Narasimhavarmaṉ II bearing a higher regnal year than his 12th year. A recently discovered copper-plate inscription of Narasimhavarmaṉ II contains some astronomical data which indicate A. D. 711 for his 12th regnal year.[4] Therefore we cannot accept Prof. Sastri's view that the Pallava king ruled for 40 years till A. D. 720 for according to the record A. D. 720 must be his 21st and not 40th regnal year.

---

1. *Ibid.* Intro. p. 18.
2. P. C. Bagchi – *India and China* (1950) p. 53. Mr. Bagchi's view is supported by Sylvain Levi – Vide *J. A.* 1900 May–June. pp. 418–421.
3. P. C. Bagchi – *Op. cit.* p. 53; K. A. Nilakanta Sastri – *Op. cit.* Intro. p. 18.
4. A. 56 of 1949–50.

As regards the date of Paramēśvaravarman II. Prof. Sastri assigns to him a period of ten years. This view is probably based on the fact that W. Chāḷukya Vikramāditya II claims that while Yuvarāja he defeated the Pallava king Paramēśvaravarman.[1] Since Vikramāditya II came to power in A. D. 733–34 the conflict mentioned above must have taken place before that. Paramēśvaravarman referred to in the records of Vikramāditya is generally identified with Paramēśvaravarman II, son of Narasimhavarman II. But we must not forget the fact that Nandivarman II Pallavamalla also had the name Paramēśvaravarman.[2] But it is not known whether even after his coronation he was called by that name by his enemies. Even after his coronation the Chōḷa king Kulōttuṅga I was called by his Pre-coronation name, Rājēndra.[3] Further there is no record of Paramēśvaravarman II bearing his 10th regnal year. Definite evidence therefore of the duration of his rule is not available. With regard to the regnal periods of Nandivarman II and his successors Prof. Sastri proceeds on the basis mentioned above. But in the case of Nandivarman III and his successors the learned historian lends his support to the theory of overlapping regnal periods. Thus, for instance, Nṛipatuṅga is said to have been made heir-apparent or Yuvarāja in A. D. 855 though his father continued to rule till A. D. 860. As to the long reign of Nṛipatuṅga, 41 years according to the recently discovered Maṭhavalam (Chittoor district) stone inscription[4] we shall discuss it at some length in due course.

---

1. *A. I.* 1946–47, No. 5, p. 54.
2. *S. I. I.* Vol. IV, No. 135, p. 11, Section C.
3. See *S. I. I.* Vol. VIII, Nos. 392 and 807.
4. *A. I.* 1946–47, No. 5, p. 54.

Dr. D. C. Sircar who concurs in Prof. Sastri's dates of Pallava kings from Narasimhavarmaṉ II to Nandivarmaṉ II differs from him in regard to the duration of the reigns of the successors of Dantivarmaṉ. Prof. Sastri thinks that the rule of Dantivarmaṉ came to an end in A. D. 845, but Dr. Sircar holds that it continued for two more years.[1] Again Prof. Sastri assigns to Nandivarmaṉ III a reign-period of 22 years from A. D. 844 while Dr. Sircar identifying Nandivarmaṉ III with Kampavarmaṉ gives him a reign-period of 25 years from A. D. 847.[2]

There is no basis for identifying Nandivarmaṉ III, with Kampavarmaṉ. Nandikampa means only Kampa, son of Nandi or Nandivarmaṉ. The practice of prefixing part of father's name to the name of the ruling king was in use in the 9th century. As for example Nandivarmaṉ III was also known as Danti–Nandivarmaṉ[3] Further the numerous lithic records of Kampavarmaṉ, some of them dated in his 26th and 32nd regnal years[4] do not mention the well-known surname of Nandivarmaṉ III viz. Teḷḷāṟṟerinda which we find in almost all his records dated after his 10th year. Nor do we find the name of Kampa in any of the inscriptions of Nandivarmaṉ III. Obviously Dr. Sircar's view is untenable[5] and the latest known regnal year of Nandivarmaṉ III is 22[6]

---

1. *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*. p. 167.
2. *Ibid*. pp. 165 and 166.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, No. 48, p. 20, LL 2&3.
4. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, Nos. 110 and 111.
5. See also paragraph 9 of *M. E. R.* 1912 and *E. I.* Vol. VII, p. 196.
6. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, No. 57.

With regard to the reign-period of Nṛipatuṅgavarmaṇ Prof. Sastri gives the date A. D. 855–896 while Dr. Sircar gives a very different date, A. D. 872–913.[1] Dr. Sircar's view on this date is based on the grounds mentioned above and on others, the Maṭhavalam inscription of Nṛipatuṅga dated in his 41st year[2], the identification of Piṟudi Gaṅgarāyar of the two Āmbūr inscriptions of Nṛipatuṅga with Pṛithivīpati I, and the identification of the Pallava mentioned in the Karandai plates with Nṛipatuṅga[3].

As regards the Maṭhavalam lithic record it may be a genuine one but no details other than the date are available. The identification of Piṟudi Gaṅgarāyar of the Āmbūr inscriptions with Pṛithīvīpati I, though supported by Dr. Hultzsch and V. Venkayya, is untenable as we have seen in connection with the W. Gaṅgas.[4] As to the Pallava mentioned in the Karandai plates of Rājēndra I it must be borne in mind that the name of the Pallava king is not given in that record. If Nṛipatuṅga were identical with the Pallava referred to in the inscription, his name would have been certainly mentioned. But the existence of Pallava princes after Āditya's conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam is very probable. Āditya I does not claim in any of his records to have extinguished the Pallava family. In case we accept Dr. Sircar's view we must postdate the battle of Srīpuṟambiyam or assign an unusually long reign - 86 years (A. D. 812–898), to Pṛithivīpati I. Neither view can be supported in the absence of concrete evidence.

---

1. *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*. p. 167.
2. *A. I.* 1946–47, No. 5, p. 54.
3. *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*. p. 166; *J. O. R.* Vol. XIX, pp. 148 and 149.
4. See the Chap. on the W. Gaṅgas

The Tiruvadi inscription of Nṛipatuṅga dated in his 18th year mentions the Pāṇḍya king Varaguṇa Mahārāja[1] who is doubtless Varaguṇa II (A.D. 862-880). This record proves that the 18th regnal yeal of Nṛipatuṅga falls before A. D. 880 when just after the battle of Śrīpuṟambiyam Varaguṇa II's rule came to a close. Thus Nṛipatuṅga did not ascend the Pallava throne in A. D. 872 as Dr. Sircar believes, but much earlier.

The Tiruchcheṉṉampūṇdi stone inscription of Nṛipatuṅga[2] contains some astronomical details which point out A. D. 867 for the 22nd regnal year of Nṛipatuṅga[3] though according to Mr. M, Somasekhara Sarma a better alternative, A. D. 884, is also possible[4].

A Bāṇa inscription from Tiruvallam (N. Arcot district) dated in Saka 810 (A. D. 888) mentions no overlord[5] thus indicating the independence of the Bāṇas. The political condition of South India after the battle of Śrīpuṟambiyam must have facilitated their assertion of independence. Now if Dr. Sircar's date for Nṛipatuṅga is accepted it will be difficult to explain how after declaring their independence in A. D. 888 the Bāṇas again became feudatory to Nṛipatuṅga in (A. D. 872+24) A. D. 896 when the Chōḷa king Āditya I had already become master of Toṇḍaimaṇadlam.

Again the date of Āditya I's conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam is also a relevant fact in examining the date of Nṛipatuṅga.

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, No. 71; 360 of 1921.
2. *S. I. I.* Vol. VII, No. 528; 303 of 1901.
3. *S. I. I.* Vol. VII. Appendix C.
4. *J. O. R.* Vol. VIII, (1934), pp. 166 and 167.
5. *S.* I. *I.* Vol. III, No. 44.

A Chōḷa inscription[1] found at Tirumālpuram (Walajapet taluk, N. Arcot district) refers to a grant made in the 21st and 22nd years of a Chōḷa king called Toṇḍaimāṇāṟṟūr-tuñjiṉadēva. This Chōḷa king is rightly identified by V. Venkayya with Āditya I and Venkayya's conclusion is supported by Dr. Hultzsch.[2] Toṇḍaimāṇāṟṟūr is identified with Toṇḍaimāṇād near Kāḷahasti.[3] The details and find-place of the record indicate that by A. D. 891 or 892 Āditya I must have accomplished at least the major part of his conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. Another record of the same Chōḷa king dated in his 24th year[4] is found at Takkōlam (N. Arcot district). A third inscription of the same Chōḷa king dated in his 27th year is found at Tirukkaḻukkuṉṟam (Chingleput district).[5] All these records unmistakably point out that before the end of the 9th century Āditya I must have established his control over Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. It is practically certain that before attempting the conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam Āditya I must have brought under his rule the entire Kāvērī region.

Two stone inscriptions of Nṛipatuṅga dated in his 22nd year are found in the Saḍaiyar temple at Tiruchcheṉṉampūṇḍi[6] near Kōvilaḍi in the Tanjore district. A third inscription of the same king dated the same year is found at Tirukkōḍikāval in the Kumbakonam taluk.[7] Another lithic record of the same Pallava dated in his 24th year is

---

1. 286 of 1906; *S. I. I.* Vol. III, No. 142.
2. *Ibid.* p. 289.
3. *Ibid.* p. 289.
4. *E. I.* Vol. XIX. No. 12.
5. *E. I.* Vol. III, No. 38A, p. 279.
6. 300 and 301 of 1901.
7. 38 of 1930-31.

found at the same place.[1] Now, if the first regnal year of Nṛipatuṅga be A. D. 872 we must believe that in A. D. 896 he was in possession of a part of the Kāvērī delta. We must further believe that before recovering the Chōḷa country proper Āditya I took Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam from Aparājita. Obviously these are untenable contentions. In other words if Dr. Sircar's date for Nṛipatuṅga is accepted it will be difficult to explain the existence of the Pallava king's records in the heart of the Chōḷa country. Nor will it be less difficult to account for the existence of Āditya I's records in the heart of the Pallava empire. It is therefore clear that Nṛipatuṅga's reign must have come to an end before Āditya I's conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam.

Further Dr. Sircar presumes that Aparājita and Nṛipatuṅga simultaneously reigned over different parts of the Pallava empire.[2] But it is very difficult to sustain this view for the find-spots of the records of the two rulers do not make such a suggestion. No doubt Aparājita's inscriptions are not seen in the Chōḷa country proper while those of Nṛipatuṅga exist there. Nevertheless the existence of the records of two kings in some places in Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam (e. g. Chittoor and Chingleput districts) precludes the possibility of partition of the Pallava empire in the time of Nṛipatuṅga.

A word about Aparājita's position in Pallava genealogy must be said here. Though the exact relationship of Aparājita to Nṛipatuṅga is not yet known it is practically

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. XII, No. 78; 22 of 1930–31.
2. *The Age of Imperial Kanauj*. p. 166.

certain that he was the successor of the latter. The Udayēndiram plates of Pṛithivīpati II[1] mention only Aparājita in connection with the battle of Śrīpuṟambiyam, and are silent on Nṛipatuṅga. Similarly Chōḷa records mentioning Āditya I's conquest of Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam do not refer to Nṛipatuṅga. On the other hand we have specific reference in the Tiruvālaṅgāḍu plates[2] to the fact that Āditya I conquered Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam from Aparājita. If Nṛipatuṅga were then alive his name would have been certainly mentioned in the record. All these evidences point to the conclusion that Aparājita must have succeeded Nṛipatuṅga some years before the battle of Śrīpuṟambiyam. There is absolutely no possibility of identifying Aparājita with Nṛipatuṅga[3] though the name Aparājita was also a surname of Pallava kings like Narasimhavarmaṉ II, son of Paramēśvarvarmaṉ I.[4]

The possibility of overlapping reign-periods particularly from the reign of Nandivarmaṉ II cannot be ruled out. But it cannot be supported in the absence of essential details.

The foregoing pages show that there is much uncertainty about the dates of the Pallavas of the 8th and 9th centuries and that the chronological and genealogical schemes of the Pallavas furnished by Mr. R. Gopalan can still be regarded as a good working hypothesis till a satisfactory alternative is available.

---

1. *S. I. I.* Vol. II, No. 76.
2. *S. I. I.* Vol. III, No. 205, v. 49.
3. *Contra* – Gopinatha Rao – *M. C. C. Mag.* Vol. XXIV, p. 538.
4. 566 of 1912.

CONCLUSION

We shall now attempt to present in brief a connected account of the part played by feudatories in Pallava history. In the 4th century A. D. we find the powerful Bāṇas siding with Mayūraśarmaṉ and making the Pallavas come to terms with him. In the next century the W. Gaṅgas are seen helping the Pallavas in subduing the Bāṇas and in fighting the hostile Kadambas. The subordination of the Chōḷas of Rēnāṇḍu was probably of considerable assistance to the consolidation and expansion of the Pallava power in the time of Simhavishṇu. But their subsequent alliance with the W. Chāḷukyas weakened the Pallavas. The Bāṇas following the Rēnāṇḍu Chōḷas threw in their lot with the W. Chāḷukyas. The defence of the north-west region of the empire thus became a formidable problem for the Pallavas and the initial triumph of W. Chāḷukya invasions of the Pallava empire in the 7th and 8th centuries was, in a great measure, due to the hostile policy of the two feudatory dynasties.

We have mentioned the possibility of the Chōḷas of the Tamil country assisting Paramēśvaravarmaṉ in his war with W. Chāḷukya Vikramāditya I. In his struggle with Chitramāya and the Tamil powers Nandivarmaṉ II was ably supported by his Muttaraiya feudatories. The part played by the Chōḷas in the siege of Nandipura is not clear, though their alliance with the Pāṇḍyas in the initial stage of the siege is quite possible. The Adigamāṉs of the Koṅgu country appear to have played a hostile part in Śrīpuruśha's invasion of the Pallava empire in the time of Nandivarmaṉ II. The Bāṇas who became again feudatory to Pallavas helped them

against the W. Gaṅgas in the 8th century. In the second half of the 8th century we find the Muttaraiyars wavering in their loyalty to the Pallavas. Their exact role in the Pallava-Pāṇḍya wars of this period is not clear. But evidence is not wanting to indicate their temporary subordination to the Pāṇḍyas. It is also clear that they were for a short period independent of the two imperial powers. At the same time the Chōḷas appear to have made common cause with the Pāṇḍyas against the Pallavas. The Adigamāṉs assisted in vain the Pallavas in combating the expansion of the Pāṇḍya power under Neḍuñjaḍaiyaṉ. Naturally the Pallava power was eclipsed for some time in the Chōḷa country in the time of Dantivarmaṉ.

The beginning of the 9th century witnessed further troubles to the Pallavas. The Bāṇas changed their allegiance to the Rāshṭrakūṭas. Taking advantage of the internal troubles of Amōghavarsha the W. Gaṅgas invaded the Pallava empire. The accession of Nandivarmaṉ III ushered in another period of Pallava-Pāṇḍya struggle. The Chōḷas of Paḷaiyāṟai seem to have played a hostile part in the battle of Teḷḷāṟu. But at the time of the battle of Kuḍamūkku they figure as the allies of the Pallavas. We do not know what part the Muttaraiyars played in the two wars. Their probable alliance with the Pāṇḍyas during this period must have afforded a good opportunity for Vijayālaya to seize Tanjore. The capture of Tanjore by the Chōḷas was the beginning of the end of Muttaraiya influence in the Kāvērī region. The Bāṇas took an important part in the wars against the Noḷambas and the W. Gaṅgas. Pṛithivīpati I's alliance with the Bāṇas was helpful to the Pallavas inasmuch as it checked the rapid progress of the hostile Noḷambas and the main branch of the W. Gaṅgas. The rift in the Noḷamba - W. Gaṅga alliance which originated in their defeat at Sōremaṭi

(A. D. 878) enabled the Pallavas to bestow their whole attention on the Pāṇḍyas. Attention has already been drawn to the great services of Pṛithivīpati I to the Pallavas in the battle of Śrīpuṟambiyam (A.D. 880). The Chōḷas stood by the Pallavas at this time. It was the support of the feudatories that was largely responsible for the victory of the Pallavas at Śrīpuṟambiyam.

The rise of the Chōḷas after this war was very striking. Neither the Pāṇḍyas nor the Muttaraiyars were in a position to check it. The Chōḷas seem to have brought the Koḍumbāḷūr chiefs and the Muttaraiyars under their control and succeeded in befriending the successors of Pṛithivīpati I. The Bāṇas became independent by A. D. 888. The growing weakness of the imperial authority is clear from the existence in a limited area of the inscriptions of Aparājita. As noted above, the immediate cause of Āditya I's conflict with his overlord is not known. But the natural tendency of a rising feudatory power to overthrow its declining paramount power may, to some extent, account for this conflict, Instances of this kind have already been cited. The downfall of the Pallavas was mainly, but not solely, due to their loss of the support of feudatories. The long struggle of the Pallavas against the W. Chāḷukyas and the Pāṇḍyas greatly exhausted them and left them at the mercy of their powerful vassals.

We have noted in detail the cultural services rendered by the feudatories. The growth of the Bhakti cult was the driving force in their cultural activities. Śaivism and Vaishṇavism made remarkable progress under the patronage of the feudatories. Jainism and Buddhism began to decline on account of the tremendous endeavours of the Nāyaṉmārs and the Āḻvārs. Attention has already been drawn to the notable contribution to Tamil literature of the Jain scholars under

the Muttaraiyars. In an age of great religious upheaval the Pallava feudatories exhibited not only tolerance but also liberality. Men of learning were patronised irrespective of their persuasions. Architecture and sculpture made great advance under the feudatories. It is interesting to note that the cave-architecture persisted much longer in the Muttaraiya region than in other parts of the Pallava empire. The high degree of Sanskrit learning that we find in Gaṅgavāḍi in the 5th century deserves special mention.

Now, the question may be raised whether on the whole the Pallava feudatories were unhelpful or helpful to the stability and progress of the Pallava empire. The answer is that they were both. The task of successfully governing a wide empire depended in those days largely on the loyalty of the local or subordinate powers. The Pallava empire was no exception. The Pallava feudatories had their own armies and were in possession of strategically important territories, and as such were able to influence the vicissitudes of the imperial dynasty. Like the other feudatories of their times, they generally acknowledged the supremacy of their powerful neighbour or the victorious enemy and rarely stood by their weak or vanquished masters. Thus when the Pāṇḍya king Neḍuñjaḍaiyaṉ alias Parāntakaṉ took the Kāvērī region from the Pallavas, the Muttaraiyars changed their allegiance to him. In times of civil war as in the reign of Nandivarmaṉ II, the feudatories ranged themselves on either side and contributed to the instability of the imperial power. If the imperial power was at any time weak, or if it began to decline, the feudatories either declared their independence as the Muttaraiyars and the Bāṇas did in the 9th century, or tried to establish their own power by overthrowing the imperial power as the Chōḷa king Āditya I did.

But the reverse of the medal cannot be overlooked. We have already noted in detail the valuable military assistance rendered by the feudatories to the Pallavas. Nandivarmaṉ II owed much to Udayachandra and to Perumbiḍugu Muttaraiyaṉ II for the stability of his rule. The support of the Bāṇas was very helpful to the Pallavas in the frontier wars and enabled them to check the incursions of the Pāṇḍyas. The part played by Pṛithivīpati I in the battle of Śrīpuṟambiyam was a remarkable one. Lastly the cultural activities of the feudatories noted in previous chapters testify to their share in the cultural progress of the Pallava empire.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1 Ancient India.

2 Annual Reports on South Indian Epigraphy

3 Archaeological Survey of India

4 Archaeological Survey of Mysore

5 *Arokiaswamy, M.*, (1) The History of the Veḷḷār Basin, 1954 (2) The Koṅgu Country, 1956

6 *Bagchi, P. C.*, India and China, 1950

7 *Balasubramaṇyan, S. R.*, Śendalai. 1952

8 *Bhavanandam pillai, S.*, (Ed.) Yāpparuṅgalam, 1916

9 Bombay Gazetteer. Vol. I., part II.

10 Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies

11 Chronological List of the Inscriptions of Pudukkottai State

12 Dr. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar Commemoration Volume 1936

13 *Duraisami pillai, Avvai. S*, (Ed.) Puṟanāṉūṟu, 1952

14 Epigraphia Indica

15 Epigraphia Carnatica

16 *Gopalan. R.*, History of the Pallavas of Kanchi, 1928

17 *Gopalaier, A.*, (Ed.) Nandikkalāmbakam, 1927

18 *Hayavadana Rao, C.*, (Ed.) Mysore Gazetteer

19 Indian Antiquary

20 Inscriptions of Pudukkottai State (Texts)

21 Journal Asiatique

22 Journal of the Annamalai University

23 Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society

24 Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society

25 Journal of Indian History

26 Journal of the Madras University

27 Journal of Oriental Research

28 Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.

29 *Karmeka Kavignar*, (Ed.) Koṅgumaṇḍalaśatakam, 1923.

30 *Krishnamacharyar, K.* (Ed.) Guruparambarāprabāvam. 1927.

31 *Krishna Rao, M. V.*, The Gaṅgas of Talkad, 1936.

32 Madras Christian College Magazine.

33 *Majumdar, R. C.*,
(Ed.) 1. The Classical Age, 1954.
(Ed.) 2. The Age of Imperial Kanauj, 1956.

34 *Mayilai Ilamuruganar* (Ed.) - Dēvāram. 1953.

35 *Mayilai Madhavadasan* (Ed.) Nālāyiradivyaprabhandam. 1950.

36 *Minakshi, C.*, Administration and Social Life under the Pallavas, 1938.

37 Nellore District Inscriptions.

38 New Indian Antiquary,

39 *Nilakanta Sastri K. A.*,
1) The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, 1929.
2) The Cōḷas (Second Edition), 1955.
3) History of South India, 1955.
4) Foreign Notices of South India, 1939.

40 Periyapurāṇam - Saiva Siddhanta Maha Samajam Edition, 1950.

41 *Pope, G. U.*, The Nālaḍiyār (English Translation), 1893

42 Proceedings of the Indian History Congress

43 Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society

44 *Raghavaiyangar; M.*, Āḻvārkaḷ Kālanilai, 1931
Śasaṉat-Tamiḻ Kavi Charitam, 1937.

45 *Rajamanikkam M.*, 1) Pallavar Varalāṟu, 1944.
2) Periyapurāṇa Ārāichchi, 1948.

46 *Ramachandran Chettiar, C. M.* (Ed.) Koṅgudēśarājākkaḷ 1950.

47 *Ramaswami Aiyangar M. S.*, Studies in South Indian Jainism, 1922.

48 *Robert Sewell,*

1) List of Antiquarian Remains in the Madras Presidency, 1882.

2) Historical Inscriptions of South India (Ed. by Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar). 1932.

49 *Sadasiva Pandarathar, T. V.,*

1) Pāṇḍyar Varalāṟu, 1952.

2) Pirkāla Chōḷar Charittiram, Vol. I, 1949.

3) Tamil Ilakkiya Varalāṟu (200–600 A. D.), 1955.

50 Sentamiḻ Vols.

51 *Sethu Pillai, R. P.* Tamiḻakam - Ūrum Pērum, 1946.

52 South Indian Inscriptions Vols. 1–13.

53 South Indian Temple Inscriptions. Vol. I.

54 *Srinivasa Pillai, K.*, Tamil Varalāṟu, Vol. I, part II, 1949.

55 *Subramanya Aiyar, K. V.*, Historical Sketches of Ancient Dekkan, 1917.

56 Tamil Poḻil Vols.

57 Travancore Archaeological Series.

58 *Thomas Watters* - On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India, Vol. II, 1905.

59 T. T. etc. Devasthanam Inscriptions (Texts and Translations) Vol. I.

60 *Venkatarama Ayyar K. R.,* (Ed.)
A Manual of the Pudukkottai State (Revised Edition); Vols. I & II, 1944

61 *Venkatasami, Mayilai Seeni,* Samaṇamum Tamiḻum. 1954

62 *Venkatasami Nattar, N. M.,* (Ed.) Aganāṉūṟu, 1946

—

Index

Errata

Page	*Line*	*For*	*Read*
4	16	Eṟeyitiadgaḷ	Eṟeyitiyaḍigaḷ
28	4	Saravanandi	Sarvanandi
40	26	Muttaraya	Muttaraiya
40	29	certainity	certainty
42	21	Vēḷ-māṟaṉ	Vēl-Māṟaṉ
44	15	Āḍigamāṉ	Adigamāṉ
54	20	Pāṇḍayas	Pāṇḍyas
55	4	Nārttāmali	Nārttāmalai
56	last line	Īśvarttu	Īśvarattu
62	9	worth-considering	worth considering
68	12	Muttariyars	Muttaraiyars
70	2	Koṟṟamaṅgalam	Koṟṟaṅguḍi
75	f.n.	Edwards's	Edwardes's
77	22	gave	give
104	16	to........	....
109	f.n.	Thomas Waters	Thomas Watters
110	f.n.	Thomas Waters	Thomas Watters
116	4	indicates	indicate
130	7	ot	of
130	heading	Pṛithivīpati II	Pṛithivīpati I
135	3	power	powers
149	8	Aprajita	Aparājita
158	24	A. D. 860	A. D. 866

Azhagu Printers, Chidambaram.